

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT



10017032567



**The Library
of
Claremont
School of
Theology**

**1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
(909) 447-2589**

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

A NEW TRANSLATION

VOLUME 128

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

A NEW TRANSLATION

EDITORIAL BOARD

David G. Hunter
University of Kentucky
Editorial Director

Andrew Cain
University of Colorado

Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J.
Fordham University

Brian Daley, S.J.
University of Notre Dame

Rebecca Lyman
Church Divinity School of the Pacific

Susan Ashbrook Harvey
Brown University

Wendy Mayer
Australian Catholic University

William E. Klingshirn
The Catholic University of America

Robert D. Sider
Dickinson College

Trevor Lipscombe
Director
The Catholic University of America Press

FORMER EDITORIAL DIRECTORS

Ludwig Schopp, Roy J. Deferrari, Bernard M. Peebles,
Hermigild Dressler, O.F.M., Thomas P. Halton

Carole Monica C. Burnett
Staff Editor

65
E653
A5313
2014

ST. EPIPHANIUS OF CYPRUS

ANCORATUS

Translated by

YOUNG RICHARD KIM

Calvin College



THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington, D.C.

Theology Library
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Claremont, CA

Copyright © 2014
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements
of the American National Standards for Information Science—
Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials,
ANSI Z39.48 - 1984.

∞

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Epiphanius, Saint, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus,
approximately 310–403.

[Ancoratus. English]

Ancoratus / St. Epiphanius of Cyprus ; translated by
Young Richard Kim, Calvin College.

pages cm. — (The fathers of the church. A new translation ;
VOLUME 128)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8132-2591-3 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Christian heresies—Early works to 1800. 2. Apologetics—
Early works to 1800. I. Kim, Young Richard, 1976– translator.
II. Title.

BR65.E653A5313 2014
273'.4—dc23 2013041514

나의 부모님께

(For my parents; Ephesians 6:1-3)

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations and Sigla	xi
Select Bibliography	xiii

INTRODUCTION

Introduction	3
--------------	---

ANCORATUS

Foreword	51
Letter from Presbyters of Syedra	53
Letter from Palladios	55
<i>Ancoratus</i>	57

INDICES

General Index	231
Index of Scriptural Allusions and Citations	239

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I was introduced to Epiphanius very early in my graduate school career at the University of Michigan, and this complicated, controversial historical figure has been at the center of my research interests ever since. I must thank my advisor and mentor Raymond Van Dam for introducing me to him. I am grateful to Matt Walhout, Dean of Research and Scholarship and to the Provost's Office at Calvin College for a Calvin Research Fellowship (Fall 2009), which facilitated my preliminary work on this volume, and I also appreciate the support and encouragement I have received from my colleagues in the History and Classics Departments.

I would like to thank Mark DelCogliano, who shared a pre-published copy of an introduction to and translations of Athanasius and Didymus the Blind (completed together with Andrew Radde-Gallwitz and Lewis Ayres), and Kelley Spoerl for her insightful comments and suggestions on the introduction. I also am indebted to Carole Monica Burnett, Staff Editor for the Fathers of the Church series, for her clear and open communication, keen eye, and astute suggestions and corrections, and to David Hunter, the Editorial Director, for his advice, direction, encouragement, and time. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their invaluable questions, suggestions, and corrections. Any errors and shortcomings that remain are my own.

As is true for all of us in the academy, any research project requires a significant sacrifice of personal time, and usually it is our loved ones who bear the greatest burden. My wife Betty and our sons Ewan and Rhys are my inspiration and joy. All my love to them. Finally, I dedicate this volume to my parents, who immigrated from South Korea in 1975 to provide their future children with the opportunity to study and to succeed. My work is in part a testament to their sacrifice and support over the years.

s.d.g.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

Abbreviations

- ACW Ancient Christian Writers. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- ANF The Ante-Nicene Fathers.
- DHGE *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*.
- FOTC The Fathers of the Church. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- GCS Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.
- Holl/Dummer Holl, Karl, *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 25, 31, 37 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1915, 1922, 1933), with revised editing by J. Dummer, volumes 2 and 3 (Berlin and New York: Akademie-Verlag/Walter de Gruyter, 1980, 1985).
- JECS *Journal of Early Christian Studies*.
- JEH *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*.
- JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- Lampe Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).
- LXX Septuagint.
- NPNF A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.
- PG Patrologia Graeca. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris, 1857–1886.
- SC Sources Chrétiennes. Paris.
- StPatr Studia Patristica.
- VC *Vigiliae Christianae*.
- Vg Vulgate.

ZAC *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum.*

ZKG *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.*

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche.*

In the footnotes, I have followed the abbreviation conventions of Lampe for Greek authors and titles of primary sources, with the exception of the *Ancoratus* (*Anc.*) and the *Panarion* (*Pan.*). In general, for classical Greek authors not in Lampe, I have followed H. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), and for references to Latin authors, I have followed P. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968) and A. Blaise and H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des Auteurs Chrétiens* (Turnhout: Éditions Brepols S.A., 1954).

Sigla

- < > editorial restoration/conjecture inserted into the text
- < ? > editorial restoration or emendation suggested in the critical apparatus
- [] words added by the translator for the sake of clarity

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Epiphanius

- Amidon, Philip. *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: Selected Passages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Bigham, Stéphane. *Ancoratus: L'homme bien ancré, Épiphane de Salamine, Archevêque de Salamine, Chypre*. Online: www.srbigham.com/articles/ancoratus.html, 2007.
- Blake, Robert, and Henry de Vis. *Epiphanius: De Gemmis*. Studies and Documents 2. London: Christophers, 1934.
- Collatz, Christian-Friedrich, and Arnd Rattmann. *Epiphanius IV: Register zu den Bänden I–III (Ancoratus, Panarion haer. 1–80 un De fide) nach den Materialien von Karl Holl*. GCS Neue Folge 13. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Dean, James. *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 11. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm. *Epiphaniï Episcopi Constantiae Opera*. 5 vols. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1859–1862.
- Esbroeck, Michel van. *Les versions géorgiennes d'Épiphane de Chyrpe, Traité des poids et des mesures*. CSCO 460–461. Scriptores Iberici 19–20. Leuven: Peeters, 1984.
- Holl, Karl. *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*. GCS 25, 31, 37. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1915, 1922, 1933. With revised editing by J. Dummer, volumes 2 and 3. Berlin and New York: Akademie-Verlag/Walter de Gruyter, 1980, 1985.
- Hörmann, Josef. *Des heiligen Epiphanius von Salamis, Erzbischofs und Kirchenlehrers: Ausgewählte Schriften*. Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 38. Kempten and Munich: Verlag der Jos. Kösel, 1919.
- Migne, J.-P., ed. *Epiphanius*. PG 41–43.
- Moutsoulas, Elias. TO «ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΤΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΤΑΘΜΩΝ» ΕΡΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΟΣ, *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 44.1–2 (1973): 157–98.
- . *ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΣ ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΟΣ ΚΥΠΡΙΟΥ (ΜΕΡΟΣ Α')*, ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΕΩΝ 74. Athens: ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ, 1997. Reprint of Holl's edition of the *Ancoratus*.

- Petavius, Dionysius Aurelianus. *S. P. N. Epiphanii Constantiae in Cypro Episcopi opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*. Paris, 1622. Greek text with parallel Latin translation, reprinted in PG 43.
- Riggi, Calogero. *Epifanio Contro Mani, Revisione Critica, Traduzione Italiana e Commento Storico del Panarion di Epifanio, Haer. LXVI*. Rome: Pontificum Institutum Altioris Latinitatis, 1967.
- . *Epifanio: L'Ancora della Fede*. Collana di Testi Patristici 9. Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1977.
- Stone, Michael, and Roberta Ervine. *The Armenian Texts of Epiphanius of Salamis: De Mensuris et Ponderibus*. Corpus Christianorum Orientalium 583, Subsidia 105. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Williams, Frank. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2 vols. (with revised first and second vols.). Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 35, 36, 63, 79. Leiden: Brill, 1987, 1994, 2009, 2012.
- Wolfsgruber, Cölestin. *Ausgewählte Schriften des heiligen Epiphanius, Erzbischofs von Salamis und Kirchenlehrers*. Bibliothek der Kirchenväter. Kempten: Verlag der Jos. Kösel Buchhandlung, 1880.

Other Ancient Sources

Ambrose of Milan

- Faller, Otto. *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars VII*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 73. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1955.
- Schenkl, Carl. *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars I*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 32. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897.

Anastasius of Sinai

- Richard, Marcel, and Joseph Munitiz. *Anastasii Sinaitae, Quaestiones et Responsiones*. Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 59. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Apollinarius of Laodicea

- Lietzmann, Hans. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule; Texte und Untersuchungen*. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1970.
- Spoerl, Kelley. *A Study of the Κατὰ Μέρος Πιστις by Apollinarius of Laodicea*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1991.

Apostolic Constitutions

- Metzger, Marcel. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques, Tome II, Livres III–VI*. SC 329. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986.

Aristides

- Geffcken, Johannes. *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern. Leipzig and Berlin: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1907.

Asterius

Vinzent, Markus. *Asterius von Kappadokien, Die theologischen Fragmente: Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 20. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Arnobius

Bryce, Hamilton. *The Seven Books of Arnobius Against the Heathen*. Edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. ANF 6. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.

Athanasius of Alexandria

- DelCogliano, Mark, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres. *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius's Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit and Didymus's On the Holy Spirit*, Popular Patristics Series 43. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.
- Egan, George. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Studies and Documents 37. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968. Includes Armenian text and English translation.
- Lebon, Joseph. *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Lettres à Sérapion sur la divinité du Saint-Esprit*. SC 15. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947.
- Newman, John. *Four Discourses Against the Arians*. Edited by P. Schaff and H. Wace. NPNF 4. Reprint. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Opitz, Hans-Georg. *Athanasius Werke II.1, Vol. 3, Die Apologien: 1. De Decretis Nicaeanae Synodi*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935.
- . *Athanasius Werke II.1, Vol. 4, Die Apologien: 2. De Sententia Dionysii, 3. Apologia De Fuga Sua (1–18)*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1936.
- . *Athanasius Werke II.1, Vol. 8, Die Apologien: 8. Historia Arianorum (32–Schluß), 9. De Synodis (1–13)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940.
- . *Athanasius Werke II.1, Vol. 9, Die Apologien: 9. De Synodis (13–55), 10. Apologia ad Constantium (1–3)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1941.
- . *Athanasius Werke III.1, Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318–328*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1934.
- Shapland, C. R. B. *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. London: The Epworth Press, 1951.
- Tetz, Martin. *Athanasius Werke I.1, Vol. 2, Die dogmatischen Schriften: Orationes I et II Contra Arianos*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Tetz, Martin, and Dietmar Wyrwa. *Athanasius Werke I.1, Vol. 3, Die dogmatischen Schriften: Oratio III Contra Arianos*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.
- Wyrwa, Dietmar, and Kyriakos Savvidis. *Athanasius Werke I.1, Vol. 4: Die dogmatischen Schriften: Epistulae I–IV ad Serapionem*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

Athenagoras

Pouderon, Bernard. *Athénagore, Supplique au sujet des Chrétiens et Sur la résurrection des morts*. SC 379. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

Basil of Caesarea

Anderson, David. *St Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit*. Popular Patristics Series 5. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.

Courtonne, Yves. *Saint Basile, Lettres, Tome I*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1957.

———. *Saint Basile, Lettres, Tome II*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1961.

———. *Saint Basile, Lettres, Tome III*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1966.

DelCogliano, Mark, and Andrew Radde-Gallwitz. *St. Basil of Caesarea: Against Eunomius*. FOTC 122. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011.

Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. *Basilius von Caesarea, Briefe, Dritter Teil*. Bibliothek der Griechischen Literature 37. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1993.

Sesboué, Bernard. *Basile de Césarée, Contre Eunome, Tome I*. SC 299. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

———. *Basile de Césarée, Contre Eunome, Tome II*. SC 305. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

Chronicon Paschale

Dindorf, Wilhelm. *Chronicon Paschale*. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae 2. Bonn: Ed. Weber, 1832.

Cicero

McGregor, Horace. *Cicero: The Nature of the Gods*. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.

Clement of Alexandria

Marcovich, Miroslav. *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 34. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Stählin, Otto. *Clemens Alexandrinus, zweiter Band, Stromata Buch I–VI*. GCS 52. Neu Herausgegeben von L. Früchtel, 4. Auflage mit Nachträgen von U. Treu. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985.

Clement of Rome

Staniforth, Maxwell. *The Apostolic Fathers, Early Christian Writings*. New York: Penguin Books, 1968.

Cyril of Jerusalem

McCauley, Leo. *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, Volume 1*. FOTC 61. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1968.

———. *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, Volume 2*. FOTC 64. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1970.

Didymus the Blind

- DelCogliano, Mark, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres. *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius's Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit and Didymus's On the Holy Spirit*. Popular Patristics Series 43. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.
- Doutreleau, Louis. *Didyme l'Aveugle, Traité du Saint-Esprit*. SC 386. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

Eunomius

- Vaggione, Richard. *Eunomius, The Extant Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Eusebius

- Heikel, Ivar. *Eusebius Werke VI, Die Demonstratio Evangelica*. GCS 23. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1913.
- Helm, Rudolf. *Eusebius Werke, siebenter Band: Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Hieronymi Chronicon, 3. Unveränderte Auflage mit einer Vorbemerkung von Ursula Treu*. GCS 24. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.
- Mras, Karl. *Eusebius Werke VIII, Die Praeparatio Evangelica, Teil I*. GCS 43. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.
- Places, Édouard des. *Eusèbe de Césarée: La préparation évangélique, Livres II–III*. SC 228. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- Schroeder, Guy. *Eusèbe de Césarée: La préparation évangélique, Livre VII*. SC 215. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1975.
- Schroeder, Guy, and Edouard des Places. *Eusèbe de Césarée: La préparation évangélique, Livres VIII–IX–X*. SC 369. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991.
- Stevenson, James. *A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church to A.D. 337*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Gregory of Nazianzus

- Gallay, Paul. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques)*. SC 250. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Vinson, Martha. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Select Orations*. FOTC 107. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003.
- Williams, Frederick, and Lionel Wickham. *St Gregory of Nazianzus, On God and Christ, The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*. Popular Patristics Series. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

Gregory of Nyssa

- Mueller, Fridericus. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora, Pars I. Gregorii Nysseni Opera 3.1*. Edited by W. Jaeger. Leiden: Brill, 1958.

Hippolytus

- Butterworth, Robert. *Hippolytus of Rome, Contra Noetum*. London: Heythrop Monographs, 1977.

Helm, Rudolf. *Hippolytus Werke, vierter Band: Die Chronik*. GCS 46. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1955.

Marcovich, Miroslav. *Hippolytus, Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Simonetti, Manlio. *Ippolito, Contro Noeto*. Biblioteca Patristica 35. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, 2000.

Homer

Munro, David, and Thomas Allen. *Homeri Opera, Iliadis I–XII, Editio Tertia*. Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Irenaeus of Lyons

Rousseau, Adelin. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre IV, Tome II*. SC 100. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965.

———. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre V, Tome II*. SC 153. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

Rousseau, Adelin, and Louis Doutreleau. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre II, Tome I–II*. SC 293–294. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

Jerome

Ceresa-Gastaldo, Aldo. *Gerolamo, Gli Uomini Illustri, De viris illustribus*. Biblioteca Patristica 12. Florence: Nardini Editore, 1988.

Feiertag, Jean Louis. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, Opera III, Opera Polemica 2: Contra Iohannem*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 79A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Helm, Rudolf. *Eusebius Werke, siebenter Band: Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Hieronymi Chronicon, 3. Unveränderte Auflage mit einer Vorbemerkung von Ursula Treu*. GCS 24. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

Hilberg, Isidor. *Sancti Hieronymi Epistulae, Pars I: Epistulae I–LXX*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 54, Second Edition. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.

Lardet, Pierre. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, Pars III, Opera Polemica I*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 79. Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.

Josephus

Thackeray, Henry Saint John. *Josephus V: Jewish Antiquities, Books I–III*. Loeb Classical Library 242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Jubilees

Charles, Robert. *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis*. Translations of Early Documents, Series I. Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917.

Wintermute, Orval. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, edited by J. Charlesworth, 35–142. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Julius Africanus

- Walraff, Martin. *Iulius Africanus, Chronographiae, The Extant Fragments*. GCS Neue Folge 15. Translated by W. Adler. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Justin Martyr

- Falls, Thomas. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Selections from the Fathers of the Church 3. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Methodius

- Bonwetsch, Nathanael. *Methodius*. GCS 27. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1917.

Oppian

- Mair, Alexander. *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus*. Loeb Classical Library 219. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Optatus

- Edwards, Mark. *Optatus: Against the Donatists*. Translated Texts for Historians 27. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997.

Origen

- Butterworth, George. *Origen: On First Principles*. Reprint, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Heine, Ronald. *Origen: Commentary on the Gospel According to John, Books 1–10*. FOTC 80. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- . *Origen: Commentary on the Gospel According to John, Books 13–32*. FOTC 89. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

Palladius

- Meyer, Robert. *Palladius, Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*. ACW 45. New York: Newman Press, 1985.

Philostorgius

- Amidon, Philip. *Philostorgius: Church History*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 23. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bidez, Joseph. *Philostorgius: Kirchengeschichte, 3. Bearbeite Auflage von F. Winkelmann*. GCS 21. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981.

Photius

- Henry, René. *Bibliothèque, Tome II*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1960.

Plutarch

- Babbitt, Frank. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume II*. Loeb Classical Library 222. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn. *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1970.

Pseudo-Athanasius

- Hübner, Reinhard. *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

Pseudo-Clement

- Rehm, Bernhard. *Die Pseudoklementinen I, Homilien*. GCS 42. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953.
- . *Die Pseudoklementinen II, Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*. GCS 51. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.

Pseudo-Lactantius

- McDonald, Mary. *Lactantius, The Minor Works*. FOTC 54. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

Socrates

- Hansen, Günther, and Manjan Sirinjan. *Socrates Scholasticus, Kirchengeschichte*. GCS Neue Folge 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Sozomen

- Hansen, Günther. *Sozomen, Kirchengeschichte*. GCS Neue Folge 4. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Tertullian

- Daly, Emily Joseph. *Tertullian, Apologetical Works*. FOTC 10. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950.

Theodoret

- Hansen, Günther. *Theodoret, Kirchengeschichte*. GCS Neue Folge 5. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998.

Theophilus of Antioch

- Dods, Marcus. *Theophilus of Antioch, Theophilus to Autolycus*. Edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. ANF 2. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Grant, Robert. *Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.

PATROLOGIES AND LEXICAL ENTRIES

- Altaner, Berthold. "Epiphanius von Salamis." In *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften, und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, 271-74. Freiburg: Herder, 1950.
- Bardenhewer, Otto. "Epiphanius von Salamis." In *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literature, dritter Band*, 293-302. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co. G.M.B.H. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.
- Bardy, Gustave. "Épiphané (Saint)—Évêque de Salamine de Chypre au IV^e s." In *Catholicisme: Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain, Tome Quatrième*, c. 320-22. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1956.
- Bienert, Wolfgang. "Epiphanius v. Salamis." In *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche, dritter Band*, c. 723-25. Freiburg: Herder, 1995.
- Bonwetsch, Nathanael. "Epiphanius von Constantia." In *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, fünfter Band, 417-21. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1898.
- . "Epiphanius of Constantia." In *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Volume 4*, 154-55. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1909.
- Canivet, Pierre. "Epiphanius of Constantia (Salamis)." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume V*, 478-79. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Dummer, Jürgen. "Epiphanius von Konstanteia (Salamis)." In *Metzler Lexikon Antiker Autoren*, edited by O. Schütze, 241-42. Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1997.
- Gögler, Rolf. "Epiphanius v. Salamis." In *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche, zweite völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, dritter Band*, 944-46. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1959.
- Gribomont, Jean. "Eustathe de Sébaste." In *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire* 4.2, 1708-12. Paris: Beauchesne, 1961.
- . "Eustathe de Sébaste." In *DHGE* 16, 26-33. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967.
- Hörmann, Josef. "Epiphanius v. Salamis (Konstantia)." In *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, zweite neuarbeitete Auflage des kirchlichen Handlexikons, dritter Band*, c. 728-30. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co. GMBH Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931.
- Jülicher, Adolf. "Epiphanius. 3." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung, elfter Halbband*, c. 193-94. Stuttgart: J. M. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907.
- Lipsius, Richard. "Epiphanius." In *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature*, edited by W. Smith and H. Wace, 300-303. London: J. Murray, 1911. Reprinted as *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Löhr, Winrich. "Epiphanius von Salamis." In *Lexicon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, edited by S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, 196-98. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1998.

- . "Palladius von Suedri." In *Lexicon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, edited by S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, 474. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1998.
- Markschies, Christoph. "Epiphanius von Salamis." In *Der Neue Pauly*, Band 3, c. 1152–53. Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1997.
- Meinhold, Peter. "Pneumatomachoi." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung* 21.1, 1066–1101. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1951.
- Nautin, Pierre. "Épiphanie (Saint) de Salamine." In *DHGE* 15, c. 617–31. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- . "Eutychius, évêque d'Éleuthéropolis en Palestine." In *DHGE* 16, c. 95–97. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967.
- Norris, Frederick. "Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 315–403)." In *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity, Second Edition*, edited by E. Ferguson, 380–81. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.
- Puech, Aimé. "Saint Épiphanie." In *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne, depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du IV^e siècle, Tome III: Le IV^e siècle*, 643–69. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1930.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology, Vol. III*, 384–96. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1960.
- Rahner, Hugo. "Epiphanius v. Salamis. Symbolum." In *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche, zweite völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, dritter Band*, c. 946–47. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1959.
- Riggs, Calogero. "Epiphanius of Salamis." In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church, Volume I*, edited by A. di Berardino, translated by A. Walford, 281–82. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- . "Palladius of Suedri." In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church, Volume II*, edited by A. di Berardino, translated by A. Walford, 637. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. "Epiphanius von Salamis." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Band 5*, c. 909–27. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1962.
- Tandonnet, Roger. "Épiphanie (saint) de Constantia (Salamine)." In *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire* 4.1, 854–61. Paris: Beauchesne, 1960.

SECONDARY SCHOLARSHIP

- Adler, William. "The Origins of the Proto-Heresies: Fragments From a Chronicle in the First Book of Epiphanius' *Panarion*." *JTS* 41.2 (1990): 472–501.
- . "The *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus and its Jewish Antecedents." *ZAC* 14.3 (2011): 496–524.
- Amidon, Philip. "Paulinus' Subscription to the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*." *JTS* 53.1 (2002): 53–74.
- Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius: The coherence of his thought*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

- . *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . "Athanasius' Initial Defense of the Term ὁμοούσιος: Rereading the *De decretis*." *J ECS* 12.3 (2004): 337–59.
- . "Innovation and Ressourcement in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 187–205.
- . "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology." In *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*, edited by Twomey and Rutherford, 57–72.
- Barnes, Michel. "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 169–86.
- Barnes, Michel, and Daniel Williams, eds. *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Barnes, Timothy. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Beatrice, Pier Franco. "The Word "*Homoousios*" from Hellenism to Christianity." *Church History* 71.2 (2002): 243–72.
- Behr, John. *The Way to Nicaea. Formation of Christian Theology 1*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- . *The Nicene Faith. Formation of Christian Theology 2*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.
- Bigham, Steven. *Epiphanius of Salamis, Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth*. Patristic Theological Library 3. Rollinsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. *Figurae: Reading Medieval Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- . *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Brakke, David. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Brennecke, Hanns. *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 73. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988.
- Bryer, Anthony, and George Georgiades, eds. *The Sweet Land of Cyprus: Papers Given at the Twenty-Fifth Jubilee Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1991*. Nicosia: The Cyprus Research Centre for The Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, 1993.
- Burns, J. Patout, and Gerald Fagin. *The Holy Spirit*. Message of the Fathers of the Church, Volume 3. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of*

- Christian Discourse*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.
- . "How to Read Heresiology." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.3 (2003): 471–92.
- . "Jews and Heretics—A Category Error?" In *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by A. Becker and A. Reed, 345–60. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Campbell, Theodore. "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27.4 (1974): 408–40.
- Camplani, Alberto. "Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia (362–363): Osservazioni sul *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, l'*Epistula catholica* e due fogli copti (edizione di Pap. Berol. 11948)." In *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, edited by E. dal Covolo, R. Uglione, and G. Vian, 191–246. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 133. Rome: LAS, 1997.
- Cavallera, Ferdinand. *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe–Ve siècle)*. Paris: Picard, 1905.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Coakley, Sarah. "Disputed Questions in Patristic Trinitarianism." *HTR* 100.2 (2007): 125–38.
- Cross, Richard. "Individual Natures in the Christology of Leontius of Byzantium." *J ECS* 10.2 (2002): 245–65.
- Daley, Brian. "Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa's Anti-Apollinarian Christology." *StPatr* 32 (1997): 87–95.
- . "'Heavenly Man' and 'Eternal Christ': Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior." *J ECS* 10.4 (2002): 469–88.
- Day, Juliette. "Cyril of Jerusalem on the Holy Spirit." In *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*, edited by Twomey and Rutherford, 73–85.
- Dechow, Jon. *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. Patristic Monograph Series 13. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- DelCogliano, Mark. "Eusebian Theologies of the Son as the Image of God before 341." *J ECS* 14.4 (2006): 458–84.
- . "Basil of Caesarea on Prov 8:22 and the Sources of Pro-Nicene Theology." *JTS* 59.1 (2008): 183–90.
- . "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3." *JTS* 61.2 (2010): 644–58.
- . *Basil of Caesarea's Anti-Eunomian Theory of Names: Christian Theology and Late-Antique Philosophy in the Fourth-Century Trinitarian Controversy*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 103. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Dörries, Hermann. *De Spiritu Sancto: Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluß des trinitarischen Dogmas*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissen-

- schaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Drecoll, Volker. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 66. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Drobner, Hubertus. *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Translated by S. Schatzmann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.
- Dummer, Jürgen. "Epiphanius, Ancor. 102,7 und die Sapientia Salomonis." *Klio* 43-45 (1965): 344-50.
- . "Die Sprachkenntnisse des Epiphanius." In *Die Araber in der alten Welt* 5.1, edited by F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, 392-435. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1968.
- . "Ein naturwissenschaftliches Handbuch als Quelle für Epiphanius von Constantia." *Klio* 55 (1973): 289-99.
- . "Zur Epiphanius-Ausgabe der 'Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller.'" In *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, 119-25. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 133. Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987.
- . "Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides." *Philologus* 138.2 (1994): 267-87.
- Elliot, Tom. "Was the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* a Pacific Document?" *JEH* 58.1 (2007): 1-8.
- Fitschen, Klaus. *Serapion von Thumis: Echte und unechte Schriften sowie die Zeugnisse des Athanasius und anderer*. Patristische Texte und Studien 37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.
- Florovsky, Georges. "The Anthropomorphites in the Egyptian Desert." In *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München 1958*, edited by F. Dölger and H.-G. Beck, 154-59. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1960.
- . "Theophilus of Alexandria and Apa Aphou of Pemjde." In *Harry Aufstryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume: On the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, English Section*, edited by S. Lieberman, 275-310. Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965.
- Fraenkel, Pierre. "Histoire sainte et hérésie chez Saint Épiphane de Salamine, d'après le tome I du *Panarion*." *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 12 (1962): 175-91.
- Frazee, Charles. "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebaste and Basil of Caesarea." *The Catholic Historical Review* 66.1 (1980): 16-33.
- Gemeinhardt, Peter. "Der *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (362) und die Vielfalt orthodoxer Theologien im 4. Jahrhundert." *ZKG* 117 (2006): 169-96.
- . "Apollinaris of Laodicea: A Neglected Link of Trinitarian Theology between East and West?" *ZAC* 10 (2006): 286-301.

- Gleede, Benjamin. *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 113. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Golitzin, Alexander. "The Vision of God and the Form of Glory: More Reflections on the Anthropomorphite Controversy of AD 399." In *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West. Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia*, edited by J. Behr, A. Louth, D. Conomos, 273–97. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- Gonnet, Dominique. "The Salutary Action of the Holy Spirit as Proof of his Divinity in Athanasius' *Letters to Serapion*," *StPatr* 36 (2001): 509–13.
- Gould, Graham. "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism." In *Origeniana Quinta. Papers of the 5th International Origen Congress, Boston College, 14–18 August 1989*, edited by R. Daly, 549–57. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 105. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- Greer, Rowan. "The Man from Heaven: Paul's Last Adam and Apollinarius' Christ." In *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, edited by W. Babcock, 165–82. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.
- Gregg, Robert, and Dennis Groh. *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Grillmeier, Alois. "Ο κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος: Eine Studie zu einer christologischen Bezeichnung der Väterzeit." *Traditio* 33 (1977): 1–63.
- Gwynn, David. *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the 'Arian Controversy'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Haldon, John. "The Works of Anastasius of Sinai: A Key Source for the History of Seventh-Century East Mediterranean Society and Belief." In *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*. Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam, edited by A. Cameron and L. Conrad, 107–47. Princeton: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1992.
- Hanson, Richard. "The Transformation of Images in the Trinitarian Theology of the Fourth Century." *StPatr* 17.1 (1982): 97–115.
- . *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Hauben, Hans. "Épiphané de Salamine sur le schisme mélitien." *Salesianum* 67.4 (2005): 737–70.
- Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. *Die Pneumatomachen: Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts*. Dissertation zur Evang.-Theologischen Fakultät der Universität, Hamburg, 1967.
- Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter, and Volker Drecoll. *Pneumatologie in der alten Kirche*. *Traditio Christiana* 12. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Haykin, Michael. "ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΣΙΛΟΥΑΝΟΣ: Silvanus of Tarsus and his View of the Spirit." *VC* 36.3 (1982): 261–74.
- . "And Who is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letter to the Church at Tarsus." *VC* 41.4 (1987): 377–85.

- . *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 27. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hildebrand, Stephen. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Holl, Karl. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 36.2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910.
- . "Ein Bruchstück aus einem bisher unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius." In *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* 26. Januar 1927, 159–89. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927. Reprinted in idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, T. 2, 204–24. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928.
- Holzmeister, Urban. "Spricht Epiphanius (Ancoratus 31,4) vom Blutschweiß des Herrn oder von seinen Tränen." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 47 (1923): 309–14.
- Hübner, Reinhard. "Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (Panarion, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata: Ps.-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos." *ZKG* 90 (1979): 201–20.
- . "Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Ps.-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos." *ZKG* 92.2/3 (1981): 325–33.
- Inglebert, Hervé. *Interpretatio Christiana: Les mutations des saviors (cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire) dans l'antiquité chrétienne (30–630 après J.-C.)*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes Série Antiquité 166. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2001.
- Irmscher, Johannes. "Die Epiphaniusausgabe der 'Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller.'" *Helikon* 22–27 (1982–1987): 535–41. (= "L'edizione di Epifanio nei GCS"). *Augustinianum* 24 (1984): 573–79.
- Jacobs, Andrew. *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- . *Christ Circumcised: A Study in Early Christian History and Difference*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Holy Spirit between Nicea I and Constantinople I." *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 48.3–4 (1981): 166–80.
- . *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians*. Hampshire: Variorum, 1991.
- Karmann, Thomas. *Meletius von Antiochien: Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr.* Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 68. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2009.
- Kattenbusch, Ferdinand. *Das Apostolische Symbol: Seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Symbolik und Dogmengeschichte, erster*

- Band: Die Grundgestalt des Taufsymbols.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894.
- Kelly, John. *Early Christian Creeds.* London: Longmans, 1950.
- . *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies.* London: Duckworth, 1975.
- . *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop.* London: Duckworth, 1995.
- Kim, Young Richard. "Reading the *Panarion* as Collective Biography: The Heresiarch as Unholy Man." *VC* 64.4 (2010): 382–413.
- . "Epiphanius of Cyprus vs. John of Jerusalem: An Improper Ordination and the Escalation of the Origenist Controversy." In *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, edited by J. Leemans, P. Van Nuffelen, S. Keough, C. Nicolaye, 411–22. *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 119. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- . "The Pastoral Care of Epiphanius of Cyprus." *StPatr* 67 (2013): 247–55.
- Kopecek, Thomas. *A History of Neo-Arianism.* 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1979.
- Kösters, Oliver. *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis: Ein Kommentar zum »Ancoratus«.* *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* 86. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Laminski, Adolf. *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen: Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert.* *Erfurter theologische Studien* 23. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH, 1969.
- Lang, Uwe. "Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos: Church Fathers, Protestant Orthodoxy, and Karl Barth." *JTS* 49.2 (1998): 630–57.
- Lebon, Joseph. "Sur quelques fragments de lettres attribuées à S. Épiphanie de Salamine." In *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, Volume I. Bibbia-Letteratura Cristiana antica*, 145–74. *Studi e Testi* 121. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque (IIe–IIIe siècles).* 2 vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. "Epiphanius' von Salamis 'Ancoratus' in säidischer Übersetzung." *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 54, 136–71. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902.
- Lienhard, Joseph. *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology.* Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
- Lim, Richard. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity. Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 23. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Loofs, Friedrich. *Paulus von Samosata: Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte.* *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 44.5. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1924.

- Lyman, J. Rebecca. "The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius' *Panarion* 64." *StPatr* 31 (1997): 445–51.
- . "Origen as Ascetic Theologian: Orthodoxy and Authority in the Fourth-Century Church." In *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, edited by W. Bienert and U. Kühneweg, 187–94. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 137. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- . "Ascetics and Bishops. Epiphanius on Orthodoxy." In *Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, edited by S. Elm, E. Rebillard, A. Romano, 149–61. Collection de l'École française de Rome 270. Rome: École française de Rome, 2000.
- Martin, Annick. *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373)*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 216. Paris: École française de Rome, 1996.
- Martin, Jules. "Saint Épiphanie." *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* 155 (1907/1908): 113–50, 604–18.
- . "Saint Épiphanie." *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* 156 (1908/1909): 32–49.
- Morales, Xavier. *La théologie trinitaire d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 180. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2006.
- Moutsoulas, Elias. "Der Begriff 'Häresie' bei Epiphanius von Salamis." *StPatr* 7 (1966): 362–71.
- Mühlenberg, Ekkehard. *Apollinaris von Laodicea*. Forschungen zu Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Palachkovsky, Vsevolod. "Une interpolation dans l'*Ancoratus* de S. Epiphane." *StPatr* 7 (1966): 265–73.
- Parvis, Sarah. *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy, 325–345*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Patterson, Lloyd. *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997.
- Piilonen, Juhani. *Hippolytus Romanus, Epiphanius Cypriensis and Anastasius Sinaita: A Study of the ΔΙΑΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ*. Sarja-Ser. B Nide-Tom. 181. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeaktameia, 1974.
- Pourkier, Aline. *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphanie de Salamine*. Christianisme Antique 4. Paris: Beauchesne, 1992.
- Rapp, Claudia. "The *Vita* of Epiphanius of Salamis—An Historical and Literary Study." 2 vols. D.Phil. Thesis, Worcester College, Oxford University, 1991.
- . "Epiphanius of Salamis: The Church Father as Saint." In *The Sweet Land of Cyprus: Papers given at the twenty-fifth jubilee Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1991*, edited by A. A. M. Bryer and G. S. Georgiallides, 169–87. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, 1993.

- Raven, Charles. *Apollinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church*. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge, 1923.
- Richard, Marcel. "L'Introduction du mot "hypostase" dans la théologie de l'Incarnation." *Mélanges de science religieuse* (1945): 5-32, 243-70.
- . "Les véritables 'Questions et Réponses d'Anastase le Sinaïte.'" *Bulletin d l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* 14 (1967-69): 39-56.
- Riggi, Calogero. "La figura di Epifanio nel IV secolo." *StPatr* 8.2 (1966): 86-107 (= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 93).
- . "Il termine «haireisis» nell'accezione di Epifanio di Salamina (*Panarion*, t. I; *De fide*)." *Salesianum* 29 (1967): 3-27.
- . "Catechesi escatologica dell'Ancoratus di Epifanio." *Augustinianum* 18 (1978): 163-71.
- . "Formule di fede in Sant'Epifanio di Salamina." *Salesianum* 41 (1979): 309-21.
- . "La catéchèse adaptée aux temps chez Epiphane." *StPatr* 17.1 (1982): 160-68.
- . "Catechesi sullo Spirito Santo in Epifanio di Salamina." In *Spirito Santo e catechesi patristica. Convegno di studio e aggiornamento, Facoltà di Lettere cristiane e classiche (Pontificium Institutum Altioris Latinitatis)*, Roma, 6-7 marzo 1982, edited by S. Felici, 59-73. Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 54. Rome: Editrice LAS, 1983.
- . "La «lettera agli Arabi» di Epifanio, pioniere della teologia mariana (Haer. 78-79)." In *La Mariologia nella catechesi dei Padri (Età postnicena). Convegno di studio e aggiornamento Facoltà di Lettere cristiane e classiche (Pontificium Institutum Altioris Latinitatis)* Roma 10-11 marzo 1989, XXV della Facoltà, edited by Sergio Felici, 89-107. Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 95. Rome: Editrice LAS, 1991.
- Ritter, Adolf. *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbols: Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II Ökumenischen Konzils*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Rousseau, Philip. *Basil of Caesarea. Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 20. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.
- Russell, Norman. *Theophilus of Alexandria. The Early Church Fathers*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Schwartz, Eduard. "Das Nicaenum und das Constantinopolitanum auf der Synode von Chalkedon." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums* 25 (1926): 38-88.
- Schott, Jeremy. "Heresiology as Universal History in Epiphanius' *Panarion*." *ZAC* 10 (2007): 546-63.
- Schultze, Bernhard. "Das Filioque bei Epiphanius von Cypern (im Ancoratus)." *Ostkirchliche Studien* 35.1 (1986): 105-34.
- Sesboué, Bernard. *Saint Basile et la Trinité, un acte théologique au IVe siècle:*

- Le rôle de Basile de Césarée dans l'élaboration de la doctrine et du langage trinitaires*. Paris: Desclée, 1998.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 11. Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1975.
- . "Il concilio di Alessandria del 362 e l'origine della formula trinitaria." *Augustinianum* 30 (1990): 353–60.
- Spoerl, Kelley. *A Study of the Κατὰ Μέρος Πιστις by Apollinarius of Laodicea*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1991.
- . "The Schism at Antioch Since Cavallera." In Barnes and Williams, *Arianism After Arius*, 101–26.
- . "Apollinarius and the Response to Early Arian Christology." *StPatr* 26 (1993): 421–27.
- . "Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition." *JTS* 45.2 (1994): 545–68.
- . "Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit." *StPatr* 37 (2001): 571–92.
- Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Tetz, Martin. "Über nikäische Orthodoxie. Der sog. *Tomus ad Antiochenos* des Athanasios von Alexandrien." *ZNW* 66.3/4 (1975): 194–222.
- . "Ein enzyklisches Schreiben der Synode von Alexandrien (362)." *ZNW* 79 (1988): 262–81.
- Troiano, Marina. "Il *Contra Eunomium* III di Basilio di Cesarea e le *epistolae ad Serapionem* I–IV di Atanasio di Alexandria." *Augustinianum* 41 (2001): 59–91.
- Twomey, D. Vincent, and Janet Rutherford, eds. *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010.
- Vaggione, Richard. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Vallée, Gerard. *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 1. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981.
- Weischer, Bernd. "Die Glaubenssymbole des Epiphanius von Salamis und des Gregorios von Thaumaturgos im Qérellos." *Oriens Christianus* 61 (1977): 20–40.
- . "Die ursprüngliche nikäische Form des ersten Glaubenssymbols im *Ankyrōtos* des Epiphanius von Salamis. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Entstehung des konstantinopolitanischen Glaubenssymbols im Lichte neuester äthiopistischer Forschungen." *Theologie und Philosophie* 53.3 (1978): 407–14.
- . *Qérellos IV 2: Traktate des Epiphanius von Zypern und des Proklos von Kyzikos*. Äthiopistische Forschungen 6. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. "Ein Stück aus dem *Ancoratus* des Epiphanius." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 38 (1911): 759–72.

- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd Ltd, 1987.
- Young, Frances M. "Did Epiphanius Know What He Meant by Heresy?" *StPatr* 17.1 (1982): 199-205.
- . *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

DICTIONARIES AND REFERENCE WORKS

- Alexander, Patrick, et al., eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style. For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- Blaise, Albert. *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*. Turnhout: Éditions Brepols S.A., 1954.
- Glare, P. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Lampe, Geoffrey. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Liddell, Henry, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

EPIPHANIUS AND THE *ANCORATUS*

The *Ancoratus*¹ is usually overshadowed by the much longer and better-known *Panarion*, and it is sometimes thought to be a sort of prequel to Epiphanius's *magnum opus* and thus of lesser importance.² This is not to say, however, that modern scholars have ignored the *Ancoratus* completely.³ Nevertheless, my goal is that with this introduction and translation, the *Ancoratus* will receive further attention as an important work in its own right, indeed as a significant representative of and contribution to the core theological discussions and disputes that were characteristic of the late fourth century. This in turn should encourage a reconsideration of Epiphanius's place among the more illustri-

1. The *Ancoratus* has been translated into several other modern languages: C. Wolfgruber, *Ausgewählte Schriften des heiligen Epiphanius, Erzbischofs von Salamis und Kirchenlehrers*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter (Kempten: Verlag der Jos. Kösel, 1880), 29–229; J. Hörmann, *Des heiligen Epiphanius von Salamis Erzbischofs und Kirchenlehrers: Ausgewählte Schriften*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 38 (Kempten and Munich: J. Kösel, 1919), 3–182; C. Riggi, *Epifanio: L'Ancora della fede*, Collana di testi patristici 9 (Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1977); S. Bigham, *Ancoratus: L'homme bien ancré, Épiphanie de Salamine, Archevêque de Salamine, Chypre*, <http://www.srbigham.com/articles/ancoratus.html> (2007). There is also a seventeenth-century Latin translation by Petau, which is presented in parallel columns to the Greek edition of *Patrologia Graeca* 43.

2. For English translations of the *Panarion*, see P. Amidon, *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: Selected Passages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2 vols. (with revised first and second volumes), Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 35, 36, 63, 79 (Leiden: Brill, 1987, 1994, 2009, 2012).

3. For example, E. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 86–104, examines portions of the *Ancoratus* for how Epiphanius understood and attacked what he thought were problematic aspects of Origen's theology.

ous Church Fathers, in particular for his unique contributions to developments in Trinitarian theology and patristic biblical exegesis.⁴ The *Ancoratus* was Epiphanius's first major written work and is therefore important to modern scholars for several reasons:

(1) It serves as the point of reference for his subsequent writings and activities, and comparisons with similar subjects addressed in the *Panarion* reveal an Epiphanius who was himself undergoing changes in his thought and theology. It also marked his first significant public engagement with the struggle between orthodoxy and heresy, as Epiphanius addressed the theological concerns of Christians who lived outside of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the *Ancoratus* foreshadowed the kind of heresy-hunting activities for which its author was notorious.

(2) It is a valuable witness to the ongoing theological disputes of the late fourth century over the relationship between Father and Son and the increasing importance of establishing an "orthodox" theology of the Holy Spirit. By and large, Epiphanius has been ignored as a part of this conversation, and this translation should encourage his inclusion among the ranks of others who wrote about the Spirit, namely, Athanasius, Didymus the Blind, and Basil.⁵

(3) It exhibits escalating concerns over the incarnational and anthropological theology of Apollinarius and the exegetical methods and theological speculations of Origen.

4. See the bibliography for the numerous dictionary entries and biographical sketches on the life and work of Epiphanius. For detailed discussions of Epiphanius's life and work, see P. Nautin, "Épiphanie (Saint) de Salamine," in *DHGE* 15 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), c. 617–31; J. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Patristic Monograph Series 13 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 25–124; A. Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphanie de Salamine*, *Christianisme Antique* 4 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1992), 29–47; O. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis: Ein Kommentar zum »Ancoratus«*, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* 86 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 17–76.

5. An exception is C. Riggi, "Catechesi sullo Spirito Santo in Epifanio di Salamina," in *Spirito Santo e catechesi patristica. Convegno di studio e aggiornamento, Facoltà di Lettere cristiane e classiche (Pontificium Institutum Altioris Latinitatis)*, Roma, 6–7 marzo 1982, ed. S. Felici, *Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose* 54 (Rome: LAS, 1983), 59–73.

(4) The *Ancoratus* demonstrates how Epiphanius was part of a larger phenomenon within late ancient Christianity of the total appropriation and reinterpretation of human knowledge, and it embodied antiquarian and encyclopedic impulses, which he channeled to substantiate the supremacy of biblical geography, history, and ethnography over and against traditional classical understandings.⁶

(5) It testifies to the centrality in Epiphanius's convictions of a creedal confession of orthodoxy, which began first with the Nicene Creed but was completed with an interpretive second creed of Epiphanius's own composition.⁷

Ostensibly, the *Ancoratus* was a long letter that Epiphanius dictated to his scribe Anatolios, in response to two letters he had received from Christians in Syedra, Pamphylia, on the southern coast of Anatolia.⁸ The epistolary form of the *Ancoratus*, however, only served as the general framework for what was actually a series of explications and excursions on a wide range of theological and exegetical issues central to the debates and disputes that simmered and often boiled over throughout the fourth century. Thus the *Ancoratus* did not fit easily into any one literary genre; it was at the same time a letter, a theological treatise, and perhaps even a series of catechetical lessons punctuated by the two creeds.⁹ Because Epiphanius tried to address many different though certainly related points of theology and biblical exegesis, it can be difficult for the modern reader to see past what appears to be a meandering and at times unfocused and disjointed discussion. Oliver Kösters's recent monograph and commentary, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis*:

6. This process is examined thoroughly by H. Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana: Les mutations des savoirs (cosmographie, géographie, ethnographie, histoire) dans l'antiquité chrétienne (30-630 après J.-C.)*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes Série Antiquité 166 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2001).

7. I include discussion on these creeds in the footnotes of *Anc.* 118-19.

8. Anatolios identified himself at the conclusion of the *Ancoratus* (119.16).

9. The conception of the *Anc.* as catechesis was first proposed by C. Riggi, "Formule di fede in Sant'Epifanio di Salamina," *Salesianum* 41 (1979): 309-21; idem, "La catéchèse adaptée aux temps chez Epiphane," *StPatr* 17.1 (1982): 160-68, and explored more recently by Y. Kim, "The Pastoral Care of Epiphanius of Cyprus," *StPatr* 67 (2013): 247-55.

Ein Kommentar zum »Ancoratus«, however, has done much to unpack, organize, and make sense of what this text was intended to be, and I reference this work often in the notes. A close examination of the *Ancoratus* can show how deeply aware Epiphanius was of the theological diversity of the debates that marked his times and how earnestly and sincerely he tried to provide answers to the questions that perturbed the Christians in Syedra, and, in extension, Christians throughout the church.

We are fortunate that Epiphanius included copies of the two letters that were sent to him from Pamphylia, because they have provided several significant details about the immediate concerns of the senders and information that helps us to establish the approximate date of composition. The epistles and requests for Epiphanius's aid came from two different parties; the first was a group of presbyters—Matidios, Tarsinos, Neon, and Numerianos—while the second, a group most likely of monks, was represented by a certain Palladios.¹⁰ The most pressing concern of the first letter was clearly “the totally corrupt heretics,” who “act impiously against God in a different way . . . against the Holy Spirit . . .,” and the second letter begged of Epiphanius, “Master, save us!” These Christians wrote under what they thought were grave circumstances, in which the “pure and correct faith” was being attacked by heretics and many in their community already had succumbed to the false doctrine. As this introduction will discuss in greater detail below, these heretics were polemically named “the Pneumatomachoi,” or “those who waged war against the Holy Spirit.”¹¹ The letters conveyed a sense of immediate alarm and concern, and thus Epiphanius's reply was neither carefully composed nor subsequently edited for publica-

10. On the two letters and the circles they represented, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 89–107. There are various theories about who this Palladios was, though there seems to be solid ground for identifying him as a local notable who later in life became a monk. He may also have been the Palladios mentioned in Basil, *epistulae* 258, 259. Cf. W.-D. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen: Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Hamburg: Dissertation zur Evang.-Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Hamburg, 1967), 62, n. 3, who identified him as a “municipal official”; C. Riggi, “Palladius of Suedri,” in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, Vol. II, ed. A. di Berardino (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 95–107.

11. On the “Pneumatomachoi,” see below, pp. 20–33.

tion. This was a lengthy response written to Christians who envisioned themselves as passengers on a ship sailing in an “unstable sea and rough water.”¹² The authors of the first letter specifically mentioned that they already had a source of help: “And many of those who seem to have been deceived have been made wholly sound by the grace of our Lord, through the writings of the bishop Athanasios, worthy of blessed memory ...”¹³ Indeed, it was likely that they possessed copies of Athanasius’s letters to Serapion, which they consulted and accepted as articulations of the correct view on the Holy Spirit.¹⁴ Athanasius, however, had died on May 3, 373, and so the concerned Christian leaders of Syedra felt compelled to look elsewhere for aid, and they identified Epiphanius as a potential rescuer against the threat of the Pneumatomachoi in their region.¹⁵ On the basis of the date of Athanasius’s death and dating information found in the *Ancoratus*, it may be inferred that Epiphanius began to work in late 373 or early 374 and concluded his letter sometime around July 374.¹⁶

Epiphanius addressed several theological issues in the *Ancoratus*, and we can divide the text roughly into several sections, though many of the discussions overlapped. Broadly, the topics he addressed included the following: the defense of the Trinity vis-à-vis the full divinity of Christ (*contra* subordinating theologies, *Anc.* 2–11, 17–19, 27–31, 41–47, 52) and vis-à-vis the Holy Spirit (*contra* the Pneumatomachoi, *Anc.* 9–11, 14–16, 70–74, 108–9); the nature of divine knowledge and foreknowledge (20–22, 108–9); the worthiness of worship and glory of both the Son and the Spirit (*Anc.* 23–26, 50–51, 67–71); the nature and purpose of the Incarnation (*Anc.* 32–40, 64–66, 75–81, *con-*

12. *Anc.*, Letter 2.4.

13. *Anc.*, Letter 1.3.

14. Cf. *Anc.*, Letter 1.3. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 90–91, following Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 33, n. 2, suggests the “writings” were Athanasius’s letters to Serapion. On Athanasius and the letters to Serapion, see below, pp. 22–26.

15. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 89–95, makes an important argument to explain why they had looked to another bishop and not to their own local bishop or metropolitan, in all likelihood because these leaders were themselves Pneumatomachoi or at least sympathetic to their theology.

16. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 80–88 on the dating of the *Anc.* At *Anc.* 60.5 and 119.1, Epiphanius included regnal formulas that provided details for extrapolating the date of composition, though these formulas are not without difficulties for interpretation.

tra Docetism, Apollinarius); the errors of Modalism and Adoptionism (*Anc.* 48–49, *contra* Sabellius, Mani, and various subordinating theologies); straightforward versus allegorical readings of Scripture (*Anc.* 52–55, 58–63, mainly against Origen); the creation of man in the image of God (*Anc.* 56–57); the complete bodily resurrection of both Christ and humanity (*Anc.* 82–100, *contra* Origen and Mani); the idolatry, immorality, and irrationality of pagan gods and myths (*Anc.* 101–6); and the justice of the one, true God, of both the Old and New Testaments (*Anc.* 110–14).

The title *Ancoratus* bears some translational challenge, and traditionally scholars have rendered it “the well-anchored man” or something to that effect.¹⁷ Kösters rightly argues, however, that this translation does not quite work, and perhaps it is best to leave the title transliterated or perhaps “anchored,” with the understanding that the term implied that the work and the persons reading it are secured in Scripture and correct doctrine as revealed and mediated by the Holy Spirit.¹⁸ Throughout this introduction, I have chosen to maintain the transliterated title *Ancoratus*. The vitally important three-volume critical edition of the *Ancoratus* and *Panarion* by Karl Holl in the early twentieth century (though not without problems), with subsequent updates by Jürgen Dummer for the latter two of the volumes, and the publication of a comprehensive index of Holl’s edition by Christian-Friedrich Collatz, Arnd Rattmann, et al., are important foundational works for continued reexamination of Epiphanius’s life and legacy.¹⁹ I have based my translation of

17. According to the foreword added to the manuscript by a later editor, the Greek title of the letter was Ἀγκυρωτός, which he identified as a βιβλίον. See p. 51.

18. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 107–11.

19. The critical edition was edited by K. Holl, *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)* in GCS (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1915, 1922, 1933), in three volumes, with revised editing by J. Dummer (Berlin and New York: Akademie Verlag/Walter de Gruyter, 1980, 1985). For a very useful index of words, names, and references in the GCS corpus of Epiphanius, see C.-F. Collatz and A. Rattmann, *Epiphanius IV: Register zu den Bänden I–III (Ancoratus, Panarion haer. 1–80 un De fide) nach den Materialien von Karl Holl*, GCS Neue Folge 13 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006).

the *Ancoratus* in this volume on Karl Holl's 1915 GCS edition of the Greek text.²⁰ Holl also published an in-depth study of the manuscript tradition for both the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion*, and Oliver Kösters has provided a useful synopsis of the major findings.²¹ In a word, with respect to the *Ancoratus*, the earliest manuscript (Codex Jenensis, or J) that reproduced the entirety of the text dates to 1304, though there is a later tradition (Codex Laurentianus, or L), and both of these manuscripts share a common ancestor. Holl's edition of the *Ancoratus* was by and large based on these two codices; and while his work has provided an invaluable resource for scholars, the edition is occasionally problematic, especially as a result of Holl's penchant for conjecture.²² While Dummer's updates to the critical edition of the *Panarion* are a great service, the first volume, which includes the *Ancoratus*, has yet to be published.²³ Thus I have used Holl's original text, though with some modifications as indicated in the footnotes and through *sigla* in the translation.

20. We do know that the *Ancoratus* was translated in subsequent centuries into Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic, and Holl was certainly aware of several of the surviving fragments in these languages. See J. Leipoldt, "Epiphanius' von Salamis 'Ancoratus' in säidischer Übersetzung," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 54 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902): 136–71; B. Weischer, *Q̅erellos IV 2: Traktate des Epiphanius von Zypern und des Proklos von Kyzikos*, *Äthiopistische Forschungen* 6 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), 50–51.

21. K. Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 36.2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910); Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 77–80.

22. See J. Irmischer, "Die Epiphaniusausgabe der 'Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller,'" *Helikon* 22–27 (1982–1987): 535–41; J. Dummer, "Zur Epiphanius-Ausgabe der 'Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller,'" in *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 133 (1987), 119–25, for discussions of the development of the modern edition and criticisms of Holl's edition.

23. The critical edition work is now under the supervision of Professor Christoph Marksches, and his plan is to publish a reprint of the original Holl edition, along with a supplementary manual that details studies and references for alterations and/or different readings of the Holl edition. Unfortunately, the revised edition and supplement were not available at the time of the completion of this translation.

EPIPHANIUS, THEN AND NOW

Epiphanius was a complicated man.²⁴ He was dogmatic about his faith, and he defended it fervently against those who he believed were heretics and enemies of what he understood to be orthodox Christianity. He guarded his own flock on Cyprus with a watchman's vigilance, but he also made concerted attempts to protect and to give guidance to other believers and their communities. Indeed, Christians in other parts of the eastern Mediterranean world actively sought his aid and knowledge, and both the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion* were the results of written requests to Epiphanius.²⁵ He was deeply committed

24. According to Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.32.3, Epiphanius was born ca. 315 "around *Besandouke*" (ἀμφὶ Βησανδοῦκη), a village in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis in Palestine, and he died at sea in 403, on the return trip from Constantinople to Constantia. There is much that is uncertain about Epiphanius's age and the dates for his time in Egypt. Generally, scholars place his birth ca. 315, which is extrapolated from more firmly established dates in Epiphanius's life (though even these are also disputed), namely, his rise to the bishopric on Cyprus (367) and the date of his death (403). Palladius, *Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi* 16, informs us about "Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, who served the Church there for thirty-six years ..." (translation by R. Meyer, *Palladius: Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*, ACW 45 [New York: Newman Press, 1985], 105); and Jerome in *De viris illustribus* 114 (composed in 393) said, "he is still alive up to this day and presently in extreme old age" (*superest usque hodie et in extrema iam senectute*). Depending on what Jerome meant by "extreme old age," we can suggest Epiphanius was in his mid- to late seventies at this point (393) and accept a range for his birth, between 310 and 320, and hence an average of ca. 315.

25. The request for the *Panarion* came from Syrian presbyters, Acacius and Paul. In addition, we have a letter (reproduced in *Pan.* 78.2.1–24.6) in response to Christians in Arabia on the proper theology of Mary, and Epiphanius wrote his treatise *de mensuris et ponderibus* at the request of a Persian priest. We also have fragments of letters he wrote to believers in Egypt about the proper calculation for Easter and on the Apollinarian heresy. See K. Holl, "Ein Bruchstück aus einem bisher unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius," in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag* 26. Januar 1927 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927), 159–89, reprinted in idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, T. 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928), 204–24; J. Lebon, "Sur quelques fragments de lettres attribuées à S. Épiphane de Salamine," in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Volume I. *Bibbia-Letteratura Cristiana antica*, Studi e Testi 121 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), 145–74; C. Riggi, "La «lettera agli Arabi» di Epifanio, pioniere della teologia mariana (Haer. 78–79)," in *La Mariologia nella*

to the monastic way of life, and he apparently spent his youthful years in Egypt learning about it and many years in Palestine putting it into practice, such that the fifth-century ecclesiastical historian Sozomen stated: "Instructed from youth by the finest monks, and on account of this having spent a great deal of time in Egypt, he became most notable for his monastic philosophy both among the Egyptians and the Palestinians."²⁶ Hand-in-hand with his zeal for monasticism was his dedication to the Scriptures; Epiphanius was deeply immersed in the Bible and knew it intimately.²⁷

While we must remain cautious about the overt praise and the image that derive from the hagiographical tradition, nevertheless we can see that his popularity in his own day and the veneration by subsequent generations of Christians attest to his lasting importance.²⁸ Though he was originally from Palestine, in 367 he was "chosen by them [Cypriotes] to be bishop of the metropolis of the island" and later was praised for his oversight of the island: "for dedicating himself to both the population

catechesi dei Padri (Età postnicena). Convegno di studio e aggiornamento Facoltà di Lettere cristiane e classiche (Pontificum Institutum Altioris Latinitatis) Roma 10-11 marzo 1989, XXV della Facoltà, ed. S. Felici, Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 95 (Rome: Editrice LAS, 1991), 89-107.

26. Soz., *h.e.* 6.32.3. On Epiphanius's monastic formation and practice, see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 32-41; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 20-33.

27. Perhaps he was also a polyglot; Jerome (henceforth Jer.), *Apologia adversus liberos Rufini* 2.22: "Why is it imputed to him as a crime that he knows the Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Egyptian, and in part the Latin language?" Many modern lexica and dictionary entries accept this detail; however, see J. Dummer, "Die Sprachkenntnis des Epiphanius," in *Die Araber in der alten Welt* 5.1, ed. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), 392-435 for a more realistic (and generally skeptical) assessment of such a claim.

28. Today, Saint Epiphanius is feted on May 12. On the hagiographical tradition, see C. Rapp, "The *Vita* of Epiphanius of Salamis—An Historical and Literary Study," 2 vols. (D.Phil. Thesis, Worcester College, Oxford University, 1991); eadem, "Epiphanius of Salamis: The Church Father as Saint," in *The Sweet Land of Cyprus: Papers Given at the Twenty-Fifth Jubilee Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1991*, ed. Anthony Bryer and George Georghallides (Nicosia: The Cyprus Research Centre for The Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, 1993), 169-87. For a very positive modern reassessment of Epiphanius, see C. Riggi, "La figura di Epifanio nel IV secolo," *StPatr* 8.2 (1966): 86-107.

and the great, coastal city, he served with such virtue, involving himself in civic affairs, that in a short while he became known to all manner of citizens and foreigners alike."²⁹ According to Jerome, even the emperor Valens recognized how popular Epiphanius was and left him alone: "For he was such a venerated man, that even reigning heretics considered it to their disgrace if they were to persecute such a man."³⁰ When Epiphanius was in the city of Jerusalem in 393 (amid a conflict with bishop John), Jerome described how "a crowd of all ages and both sexes was flocking together to him [Epiphanius], offering their little ones, warmly kissing his feet, plucking at the fringes of his clothes."³¹ Sozomen later concluded, "Hence, I think that he is entirely the most famous man under heaven, so to speak."³²

Not all, however, was as rosy as Epiphanius's admirers would have us believe, and there is a dark side to both the historical and the received Epiphanius that must be reckoned with. Epiphanius was prone to an attitude of self-righteousness, narrow-mindedness, and bullying, and it is fair to say that he meddled in affairs that lay outside of his authority and jurisdiction. He perceived himself to be a defender of orthodoxy, an identity that he seemed to have forged early in his life. Epiphanius wrote about how as a young monk in Egypt (ca. 330-ca. 340), he encountered members of a Gnostic community, and how certain "attractive girls" from this group tried to seduce him to their beliefs and practices. When he discovered that many of them were actually hiding within the congregation of the local church, he informed the bishop and set about expelling eighty of them from the city.³³ This was his first heresy-hunting experience. Later, as abbot of his monastery in Palestine (ca. 340-ca. 367), Epiphanius again related a story of how he exposed and expelled a certain hermit named Peter, founder of the Archontic heresy.³⁴ After he became bishop of Cyprus (ca. 367), he involved himself

29. Soz., *h.e.* 6.32.4. Epiphanius was bishop of Constantia, formerly Salamis. On the uncertain circumstances of his selection, see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 41-43, but also P. Nautin, "Eutychius, évêque d'Éleuthéropolis en Palestine," in *DHGE* 16 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967), c. 95-97.

30. Jer., *contra Iohannem Hierosolymitanum* 4.

31. Jer., *c. Ioan.* 11.

33. *Panarion* 26.17.1-9.

32. Soz., *h.e.* 6.32.4.

34. *Pan.* 40.1.1-7.

in a number of disputes and controversies, sometimes by request and at other times by his own initiative.³⁵ Together, these experiences, as related by Epiphanius himself, revealed key moments in his life that reflected the ongoing formation of the infamous heresy-hunter, a role that reached its climax at the end of the fourth century during the so-called Origenist controversy.³⁶ The events unfolded in two phases, with the first conflict taking place in Jerusalem against Bishop John of Jerusalem and the second in Constantinople with John Chrysostom. In the first phase, Epiphanius drew the battle lines between the orthodox and the heterodox by obliging Christians in Palestine to choose between condemning Origen and condemning themselves, and he successfully compelled Jerome to become his ally and an open anti-Origenist.³⁷ In the second phase, at the behest of Theophilus of Alexandria, Epiphanius traveled to Constantinople in an attempt to secure the condemnation and deposition of John Chrysostom as an Origenist, though ultimately it seemed he was played the fool, a pawn used in the sinister, politically-motivated machinations of Theophilus.³⁸ Throughout his life, Epiphanius

35. Epiphanius traveled to Antioch in either 376 or 377 (see below, p. 37) in an attempt to resolve the Melitian schism (*Pan.* 77.20.1–24.5), as well as to Rome to appear before Pope Damasus in 382 over the same issue (*Jer., Epistulae* 108).

36. On Epiphanius's involvement in the Origenist controversy, see Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, and Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*.

37. In the first phase, he was able to enlist the support of Jerome for the anti-Origenist camp, and he eventually traveled to Jerusalem in 393 to attack Bishop John for his alleged Origenism (*Jer., c. Ioan.; Ep.* 51). For Jerome, see J. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), especially 195–209. See Y. Kim, "Epiphanius of Cyprus vs. John of Jerusalem: An Improper Ordination and the Escalation of the Origenist Controversy," in *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 119, ed. J. Leemans, P. Van Nuffelen, S. Keough, C. Nicolaye (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 411–22, for his "recruitment" of Jerome and his provocative conflict with John.

38. In fact, Epiphanius spent his final days in Constantinople and died at sea on the return journey (cf. Socrates, *historia ecclesiastica* 6.10.1–14.12; Soz., *h.e.* 8.14.1–15.7). For the conflict with Chrysostom, see J. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London: Duckworth, 1995), 191–290. For Theophilus, see Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 105–21; N. Russell, *Theophilus of Alexandria, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2007), 15–35. Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 210: "As he contemplated the futility of his [Epiphanius's] too hastily undertaken journey, did it perhaps occur to him that Theophilus had been cynically using him for his own purposes?"

was driven by his convictions as one of the orthodox, and from a very young age he learned that heresy and heretics were not simply to be ignored or marginalized, but rather to be identified, refuted, and expelled from the true Church. Thus despite the almost universal adoration of the hagiographical tradition, Epiphanius must have had many enemies and detractors.

In fact, the negative perception and reception of Epiphanius continued long after his death. In the ninth century, the great Byzantine bibliophile Photius noted that "his style is poor, and of such a level as is proper of one who is not guided by Attic elegance," and this negative assessment of Epiphanius's written style has been echoed in modern scholarship: "In his writing he is often imprecise, superficial, and verbose and, as Photius (Cod. 122) already had noted, generally lacked in cultivated form as well as the Attic spirit."³⁹ The underlying implication of this particular criticism is that there were tangible limits to Epiphanius's intellect, and the low estimation of his thinking has been magnified by the fact that he was a contemporary of some of the greatest theologians and writers of the Christian tradition, many of whom were highly educated and wrote with exceptional style and sophistication. As Pierre Nautin noted, "In fact, Epiphanius seems to be a complete stranger to classical *paideia* and is, in this regard, a unique exception among the grand authors of this age."⁴⁰ Richard Hanson described Epiphanius as a "second-rate theologian standing in the tradition of Athanasius" and as a "writer who is narrow-minded at best and very silly at worst."⁴¹

Many modern scholars also have found distasteful Epiphanius's rather narrow and quite intolerant attitude toward those who were not in line with his own views: "It is Epiphanius's inflated self-esteem which renders him least attractive. It is clear that he considered his own scholarship superior to most, and his own word on any question of importance decisive; once he

39. Photius, *Bibliotheca* Codex 122. B. Altaner, "Epiphanius von Salamis," in *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften, und Lehre der Kirchenväter* (Freiburg: Herder, 1950), 272 (translation mine).

40. Nautin, "Épiphane," c. 625 (translation mine).

41. R. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 658.

had pronounced, nothing need be added. Nor was he given to regarding opponents with respect."⁴² In addition to his personal and often uninvited involvement in ecclesiastical affairs, the other source for negative assessments of Epiphanius has been his literary work. His most significant work was the *Panarion*, or "medicine chest," an immense heresiology containing descriptions of the beliefs and practices, as well as corresponding refutations, of eighty different heresies that had plagued Christianity. Modern scholars have mined the *Panarion* for the information it provides on both well-known and more obscure heresies, and they have appreciated Epiphanius at least for the sheer effort of such a work and for the reproduction of documents which otherwise might have been lost (as, for example, Ptolemy's letter to Flora): "The work of Epiphanius, in fact, is a mine of useful information to the historian, even more so as the exposed doctrines were closer to his own times. In the expansion of his own research, he made use of documents, which have been passed down only by him."⁴³ Scholars also have recognized, however, that the genre of heresiology was at its core an exercise in rhetorical and polemical construction, and thus that the contents of heresiologies do not necessarily reflect historical reality but rather the perceptions and convictions of the author himself and/or of his particular community.⁴⁴ This observation was true of Epiphanius, and he exhibited throughout the *Panarion* his distinctive rhetorical and polemical use and understanding of heresy.⁴⁵ Indeed, the theme of the *Panarion* as

42. Williams, *The Panarion* (1987), xxv.

43. Riggi, "La figura di Epifanio," 87 (translation mine). See A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du IV^e siècle. Tome III. Le IV^e siècle* (Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1930), 654, which expresses well the typical tempered praise of Epiphanius: "... mais, pour réaliser l'oeuvre avec les proportions qu'il lui donna, il dut dépenser un travail énorme, qui impose le respect et dont on souhaiterait seulement qu'il eût été dirigé par une intelligence plus ferme et plus capable de critique." For the *Letter to Flora*, see *Pan.* 33.3.1-7.10.

44. For the development of heresiology as a genre, see A. Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque (II^e-III^e siècles)*, 2 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985); Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie*, 53-75; Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 393-461.

45. For earlier studies on Epiphanius's notion of heresy, see P. Fraenkel,

medicine chest, with its emphasis on the poisons of heretics and the antidotes and cures against their bites and stings, only further underscored his proclivity for polemic. There was certainly no lack of insults and invective in this work. Thus, the enormity and rhetorical intensity of the *Panarion* have cast long shadows over the *Ancoratus* and Epiphanius's other writings, which included a handful of important letters and minor treatises.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the *Ancoratus* really was a different, self-standing work that ought to have greater recognition among modern scholars for its attempt to articulate Trinitarian and Christological theology, and Epiphanius should be part of contemporary examinations, along with Athanasius and Basil, on the debates of the late fourth century.

"Histoire sainte et hérésie chez saint Épiphane de Salamine, d'après le tome I du *Panarion*," *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 12 (1962): 175–91; E. Moutsoulas, "Der Begriff 'Häresie' bei Epiphanius von Salamis," *StPatr* 7 (1966): 362–71; C. Riggi, "Il termine «haireisis» nell'accezione di Epifanio di Salamina (*Panarion*, t. I; *De fide*)," *Salesianum* 29 (1967): 3–27; G. Vallée, *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 1 (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981); F. Young, "Did Epiphanius Know What He Meant by Heresy?" *StPatr* 17 (1982): 199–205.

For critical examinations of Epiphanius's understanding and construction of heresy and his place in the heresiological tradition, see Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie*, 77–114; R. Lyman, "The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius's *Panarion* 64," *StPatr* 31 (1997): 445–51; eadem, "Origen as Ascetic Theologian: Orthodoxy and Authority in the Fourth-Century Church," in *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 137, ed. W. Bienert and U. Kühneweg (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 187–94; eadem, "Ascetics and Bishops. Epiphanius on Orthodoxy," in *Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, ed. S. Elm, E. Rebillard, A. Romano, Collection de l'École française de Rome 270 (Rome: École française de Rome, 2000), 149–61; A. Cameron, "How to Read Heresiology," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.3 (2003): 471–92; J. Schott, "Heresiology as Universal History in Epiphanius's *Panarion*," *ZAC* 10 (2007): 546–63.

46. For example, his correspondence during the Origenist controversy (preserved and translated into Latin by Jerome), letters (disputed) relating to his perspective on images, and the minor works, *de fide* (appended to the *Pan.*), *de mensuris et ponderibus*, and *de XII gemmis*. See bibliography for references to editions and translations.

TOWARDS THE TRINITY

The decades between 310 and 381 were a remarkable period in the continuation of the on-going theological disagreements over the nature and status of the Son, with numerous theologians competing and clashing with one another, and each representing theologies that spanned the spectrum between subordination and correlation of the Son with the Father.⁴⁷ On one end, theologians such as Eusebius of Caesarea, Asterius the so-called sophist, and Eusebius of Nicomedia were characterized by their opponents as supporters of Arius who formed an “Arian”⁴⁸ faction or

47. For recent discussions of this very complicated period, see the excellent studies by R. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); J. Behr, *The Nicene Faith, Formation of Christian Theology 2* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2004); K. Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011). Also noteworthy is the special issue *HTR* 100.2 (2007): 125–75, dedicated to critiques and responses to Ayres, *Nicaea*. See especially the introduction to the issue by S. Coakley, “Disputed Questions in Patristic Trinitarianism,” *HTR* 100.2 (2007): 125–38, which offers a useful assessment of the *status quaestionis* vis-à-vis discussions of Ayres’s book.

For other in-depth studies on fourth-century theology, politics, and history, especially as related to “Arianism,” see M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, *Studia Ephemeridis “Augustinianum”* 11 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum “Augustinianum,” 1975); T. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1979); R. Gregg and D. Groh, *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981); R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd Ltd, 1987); H. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer: Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie* 73 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988); Hanson, *The Search*; C. Kannengiesser, *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians* (Hampshire: Variorum, 1991), which is a collection of published articles; M. Barnes and D. Williams, eds., *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993); J. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999).

48. I recognize that the term “Arian,” both in ancient and modern usage, and the related derivatives “Semi-Arian” (ancient) and “Neo-Arian” (modern) are fraught with historical problems (the same can be said of “Pneumatomachoi,” “Nicene,” “Neo-Nicene,” “Non-Nicene,” “Pro-Nicene”). I use the ancient

conspiracy of the Eusebians.⁴⁹ The other end included Alexander of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Marcellus of Ancyra, who would himself run into serious trouble for his borderline modalistic commitment to a monadic theology of the Godhead (among other issues). Soon others added their voices to the ever-growing chorus of disputing theologians, perhaps no one more significant than Athanasius,⁵⁰ who assumed the mantle of Nicene orthodoxy (though not immediately after the Council), and later Aetius and Eunomius, who took subordinating theology to one of its logical conclusions, that the Son was *unlike* the Father. Furthermore, with the prospects of imperial favor and patronage, the political stakes became only greater, and the sheer number of councils, synods, decisions, rejections, reactions, and counter-

terms in this introduction as much as is possible in connection with the perspective and polemic of Epiphanius (and Athanasius) himself. See Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 21–36, for a succinct summary of the issues related to “Arian.” See also the important study by D. Gwynn, *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the ‘Arian Controversy’* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), who demonstrates just how much modern scholarship has been influenced by the Athanasian narrative of the fourth century.

49. Named such after Eusebius of Nicomedia. For the construction of the “Eusebians” as a “faction,” see Gwynn, *The Eusebians*. Scholars in the past have also connected the so-called “Eusebians” to the teaching and influence of Lucian of Antioch; cf. Williams, *Arius*, 63. In *Pan.* 69.6.7, Epiphanius preserved a letter from Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia referring to the latter as a “co-Lucianist.” For what, if anything, we can recover as Lucian’s theology, see Hanson, *The Search*, 79–83; Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 48–53. Gwynn, *The Eusebians*, 202–5, is much more cautious about a link between the “Eusebians” and a “Lucianist school,” whereas S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy*, 325–345 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 40–43, views the connection as real.

50. Athanasius, in his *orationes tres adversus Arianos* (*Ar.*), was the first to call his theological opponents “Arians” (and “Ario-maniacs”). See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 100–130, and Gwynn, *The Eusebians* on Athanasius’s seemingly singular role in the creation of an “Arian conspiracy.” Epiphanius fell very much in line with the Athanasian construction and narrative of the “Arianism” that threatened true Christians throughout the fourth century.

For broader studies of Athanasius and the historical context of his thinking and activity, see T. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993); D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); A. Martin, *Athanase d’Alexandrie et l’Église d’Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*, Collection de l’École française de Rome 216 (Paris: École française de Rome, 1996).

reactions to the debates on the nature of the Son are bewildering and can present quite a challenge for the modern scholar to sort out.⁵¹

A fundamental problem that undergirded the debates of the fourth century was how to reconcile monotheism with an appropriate, coherent, and consistent theology of the Father and the Son.⁵² Another dilemma was the question of how to conceive of and define the relationship between a transcendent God and a material and finite creation and then to explain the mediating role of Christ in the redemption of humanity.⁵³ Theologians turned to concepts and vocabulary drawn from the Greek philosophical tradition, though in doing so they faced an immediate challenge.⁵⁴ On the one hand, although *hypostasis* appeared in Scripture, it did not convey the same sense of individual existence that it did in its later use.⁵⁵ On the other hand, *ousia* was a non-scriptural word, and yet it became an important and loaded term in the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century.⁵⁶ And thus the recourse to the language of philosophy engendered another immediate, related problem: how to coordinate and correlate the testimony and exegesis of Scripture with the non-biblical technical vocabulary that became essential to the articulation of the theology relating to the Godhead and to the Incarnation.⁵⁷ Another problem, which became acute in

51. Useful places to start include the following: Hanson, *The Search*; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 11–269; and Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 61–122.

52. See J. Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, *The Formation of Christian Theology 1* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), for a useful survey of developments in theology before the fourth century.

53. This problem is explored fully in K. Anatolios, *Athanasius: The coherence of his thought* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

54. Hanson, *The Search*, 84–94.

55. Hanson, *The Search*, 181–83. X. Morales, *La théologie trinitaire d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 180 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2006), 21–79.

56. For the pre-Christian development of this concept, see C. Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), and P. Beatrice, "The Word *Homoousios* from Hellenism to Christianity," *Church History* 71.2 (2002): 243–72. Also see Hanson, *The Search*, 183–84; Morales, *La théologie*, 235–405.

57. On the centrality of Christian understandings of biblical exegesis and the articulation of orthodox theology, see F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), es-

the fourth century, was that theologians were essentially talking past each other, using the same terminology but understanding the terms differently:

The search for the Christian doctrine of God in the fourth century was in fact complicated and exasperated by semantic confusion, so that people holding different views were using the same words as those who opposed them, but, unawares, giving them different meanings from those applied to them by those opponents.⁵⁸

It is essential to bear in mind that the disputes over biblical exegesis, philosophical concepts, and technical vocabulary that characterized the fourth century did not suddenly emerge in the post-Constantinian world; rather, they were part of a lengthy and complicated negotiation of theology, liturgy, rhetoric, and ecclesiastical politics reaching back to the earliest days of the Christian faith.

Enter the Holy Spirit

In the midst of the disputes over the theology of the Son that occupied the middle decades of the fourth century, one could imagine that there was only a little room for discussion about the Holy Spirit, and indeed it would take some time before theologians fully engaged with any notion of an orthodox Pneumatology.⁵⁹ It seems that more often than not, discussions of the theol-

pecially 29–45 on Athanasius. Also Ayres, *Nicaea*, 335–41, for pro-Nicene approaches to exegesis.

58. Hanson, *The Search*, 181. Both *hypostasis* and *ousia* were used synonymously well into the fourth century. Again, Hanson, *The Search*, 185–88, provides several examples of the interchangeable use of the terms early in the dispute by Eusebius of Caesarea, Alexander of Alexandria, and Arius.

59. This is not to say, however, that Christians did not think about or write on the nature of the Holy Spirit prior to the fourth century, and Origen is notable in this regard. See M. Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 169–86, who argues that Christian pneumatologies in the first two centuries were drawn from Jewish understandings, until the time of Origen and Tertullian, who both rejected the Jewish conceptual frameworks and established different theologies of the Spirit.

For developments in Christian Pneumatology in the fourth century, see Morales, *La théologie*, 104–16. Useful summaries also found in Simonetti, *La crisi*, 362–77; Hanson, *The Search*, 738–48; M. Haykin, *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis*

ogy of the Holy Spirit were incidental and always in conjunction with ongoing arguments concerning the Son. For most eastern theologians of the early and mid-fourth century, the Holy Spirit was certainly recognized as a *hypostasis*, but third in rank, and was conceived as an assistant to the divine *Logos*: "the Paraclete-Spirit is neither God nor Son."⁶⁰ In contrast, in the theology of Marcellus, the Spirit was apparently understood simply to be "God with his *Logos*," both before and after the Incarnation, and not an independent *hypostasis*.⁶¹ In the theology of Eunomius, Lewis Ayres argues, "The Spirit is understood on the same schema, not as an activity of God that is somehow also an essence, but as a product of the divine will created through the Son and inferior to Son."⁶² And so it seems that the Holy Spirit received only limited attention in the immediate decades following Nicaea, and perhaps it is fitting to say that across the theological spectrum, the general tendency was toward a subordination of the Spirit. In the twenty years, however, before the Council of Constantinople in 381,

of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 9–18.

60. Cf. Eus., *de ecclesiastica theologia* 3.6.3, quoted in Hanson, *The Search*, 55. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra*, 121–23, also adds that Eusebius believed the Spirit to be a *hypostasis*, but said very little else about the Spirit, especially on the question of divinity.

For Asterius on the Spirit, see A. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen: Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert*, Erfurter theologische Studien 23 (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH, 1969), 12–19; M. Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien, Die theologischen Fragmente: Einleitung, Kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 51–52.

61. Hanson, *The Search*, 229 (drawing on Eus., *e. th.* 3.6.114), explains: "No doubt Marcellus believed that the Spirit was simply God with his *Logos* before the Incarnation and after the Incarnation was also God with his *Logos*, independent of the human body assumed.... The Spirit remains inseparably in God, but goes forth as activity from the Father and the *Logos*." Or simply put: "Marcellus does not have a developed doctrine of the Holy Spirit" (Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra*, 53).

62. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 148. Cf. Eunomius, *apologeticus* 25: "... since he was brought into existence at the command of the Father by the action of the Son. He is honoured in third place as the first and greatest work of all, the only such 'thing made' of the Only-begotten, lacking indeed godhead and the power of creation, but filled with the power of sanctification and instruction" (trans. R. Vaggione, *Eunomius. The Extant Works* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987], 69).

there was an intensification of the debate on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit, spurred on by several ongoing issues and developments in theology and practice throughout the fourth century including the continuing disputed theology of the Son. The quarrels over the Son in some ways fed logically into debates over the explicit subordination and denial of the Spirit's divinity, arguments for the basis of biblical and spiritual authority, and the importance of the role of the Spirit in the ascetic lifestyle.⁶³

Athanasius and the "Tropikoi"

The earliest identifiable group of those who explicitly subordinated the Holy Spirit was the so-called "Tropikoi"⁶⁴ in Egypt, who apparently had an orthodox view of the Son but claimed that the Holy Spirit was a creature, differing from angels only in degree.⁶⁵ Athanasius polemically equated them to the Arians, because they believed the Spirit to be a creature:

63. For an overview of how fourth-century, pro-Nicene theologians shifted the ways in which they identified and understood the Spirit, see L. Ayres, "Innovation and *Ressourcement* in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology," *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 187–205.

64. There is some dispute as to exactly who these Tropikoi were. C. Shapland, *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (London: The Epworth Press, 1951), 32–34, hypothesizes that they were influenced by Aetius and Eunomius in 356, but later returned to the church and were willing to confess the *homoousion* of the Son but maintained their view of the Spirit as a creation. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 30–35, disagrees with Shapland and sees the Tropikoi as derivative of Homoiousian theology. Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 18–24, does not identify the theological pedigree of the Tropikoi but does call them "the first group to whom the name 'Pneumatomachoi' may be properly given" (20). Their name derives from the accusation that they used certain *tropoi* to circumvent slyly and manipulate passages of Scripture that affirmed the divinity of the Spirit. See Shapland, *The Letters*, 85, n. 9, for origin of the name "Tropikoi." Ath., *epistulae ad Serapionem* 1.32.2, also used the term πνευματομαχοῦντες to describe them.

65. On the Spirit as angelic, see Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.10.4–12.5. For the numbering of the letters, I follow the scheme described by M. DelCogliano, A. Radde-Gallwitz, L. Ayres, *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius's Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit and Didymus's On the Holy Spirit*, Popular Patristics Series 43 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 48–50, which is based on the critical edition by D. Wyrwa and K. Savvidis, *Athanasius Werke I.1, Vol. 4: Die dogmatischen Schriften: Epistulae I–IV ad Serapionem* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010).

For the development of Athanasius's Pneumatology and the letters to Sera-

So then, on the one hand, this kind of thinking is not foreign to the Arians. For having once denied the Word of God, it is natural for them also to disparage his Spirit in the same way. Thus we don't need to say anything more against them. For what we have already said against them is sufficient. But on the other hand, in order to respond to those who have been deceived about the Spirit through a certain "mode of exegesis" (as they themselves would say), it would be fitting for us to subject a few of their tenets to a careful examination.⁶⁶

Athanasius wrote a series of letters in 359–361 to Serapion,⁶⁷ bishop of Thmuis, to aid in refuting the Tropikoi by emphasizing the inextricable link between the Son and the Spirit.⁶⁸ The Spirit is present in the activity of the Son and complements and completes the Son's activity; and because of this, the Spirit is connected to the Father, just as the Son is, as they both share in the same creating,⁶⁹ saving,⁷⁰ sealing,⁷¹ and sanctifying⁷² work,

pion, see J. Lebon, *Athanase d'Alexandrie, Lettres à Sérapion sur la divinité du Saint-Esprit*, SC 15 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947), 7–77; Shapland, *The Letters*, 34–43; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 51–100; T. Campbell, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27.4 (1974): 408–40; C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Holy Spirit between Nicea I and Constantinople I," *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 48.3–4 (1981): 166–80; Hanson, *The Search*, 748–53; Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 59–103; Martin, *Athanase*, 533–36; Morales, *La théologie*, 116–37; and DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 15–25.

66. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.2.1–2 (trans. DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 54).

67. See K. Fitschen, *Serapion von Thumis: Echte und unechte Schriften sowie die Zeugnisse des Athanasius und anderer*, Patristische Texte und Studien 37 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992). On the dating, see DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 25–29.

68. Morales, *La théologie*, 92, describes Athanasius's use of a principle of "transitivity," in which the bishop established first the divinity of the Son, primarily in the first letter to Serapion, then reasoned that the Spirit, as the Son, must also be divine because they share together in the work and attributes of the Father. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 155–65; Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 127–35; D. Gonnet, "The Salutary Action of the Holy Spirit as Proof of his Divinity in Athanasius' *Letters to Serapion*," *StPatr* 36 (2001): 509–13.

69. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.24.5–6, 2.13.4–14.1; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 146–47; Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 102–11.

70. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 155–65; Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 127–35.

71. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.23.4–7, 2.12.1–3.

72. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.22.3–23.1; Campbell, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," 412–13, 430; Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 86–88.

and therefore must be divine and not a creature.⁷³ Within the Godhead, there cannot be a combination of creator and created,⁷⁴ immutable and mutable.⁷⁵ In Athanasius's logic, if the Tropikoi have a mistaken view of the Spirit, then ultimately they must also have an incorrect view of the Son. Thus, in these letters we find some important early reflections on the nature of the Holy Spirit, and clearly Athanasius became an important voice and figure in the development of an orthodox Pneumatology.⁷⁶

Following his return to Alexandria on February 21, 362, after the decree by the emperor Julian that recalled exiled bishops, Athanasius convened a synod.⁷⁷ One of the documents that resulted from this gathering was a letter sent to Antioch, the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, which was intended to broker a reconciliation between the divided orthodox Christians in the regional capital.⁷⁸ One faction, loyal to the pro-Nicene legacy of Eustathi-

73. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.30.4–33.6, with hints of such a connection in Ath., *Ar.* 1.47. On Athanasius's view of the unity of divine activity among the Persons of the Trinity, see Morales, *La théologie*, 155–87, and Campbell, “The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,” 414–21, 427–28. On the theology of the Spirit in his orations against the Arians, see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 36–51.

74. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.2.3–6, 1.30.4–33.6; 2.16.1–3. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 71; Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 77–92.

75. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.26.1–6.

76. In fact, Martin, *Athanase*, 534, says about Athanasius: “On a vu dans ces lettres le plus ancien exposé attesté d'une véritable théologie du Saint-Esprit.”

77. For the synod in Alexandria, see Simonetti, *La crisi*, 358–72; Hanson, *The Search*, 639–53; M. Simonetti, “Il concilio di Alessandria del 362 e l'origine della formula trinitaria,” *Augustinianum* 30 (1990): 353–60; Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 155–58; Martin, *Athanase*, 542–65; A. Camplani, “Atanasio e Eusebio tra Alessandria e Antiochia (362–363): Osservazioni sul *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, l'*Epistula catholica* e due fogli copti (edizione di Pap. Berol. 11948),” in *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 133, ed. E. dal Covolo, R. Uglione, and G. Vian (Rome: LAS, 1997), 191–246; Morales, *La théologie*, 358–65; T. Karmann, *Meletius von Antiochien: Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n.Chr.*, Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 68 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2009), 168–92.

78. On the *Tomus*, see Simonetti, *La crisi*, 367–68; M. Tetz, “Über nikäische Orthodoxie. Der sog. *Tomus ad Antiochenos* des Athanasios von Alexandrien,” *ZNW* 66.3/4 (1975): 194–222; P. Amidon, “Paulinus' Subscription to the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*,” *JTS* 53.1 (2002): 53–74; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 173–75; Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 95–100; P. Gemeinhardt, “Der *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (362) und die Viel-

us of Antioch, was led by Paulinus, while the other was guided by Meletius, who was initially appointed bishop of Antioch in 360 by the Homoians, but his somewhat ambiguous theological position made him suspect in the eyes of his appointers and the emperor Constantius.⁷⁹ The *Tomus* demonstrated significant theological accommodation, and it evaded a definitive, dogmatic answer on the question of one *hypostasis* or three *hypostases* in relation to the Godhead.⁸⁰ The open-ended language in the *Tomus* has been interpreted by modern scholars as an attempt at theological and political rapprochement between Athanasius and his supporters and some of his more moderate opponents, namely, the Meletians in Antioch, in opposition to the growing strength of the Homoians.⁸¹ One of the theological points discussed at the synod, however, was the Holy Spirit, and this concern must have stemmed in part from Athanasius's correspondence with Serapion: "For those who, pretending to utter the faith confessed at Nicaea but daring to blaspheme against

falt orthodoxer Theologien im 4. Jahrhundert," *ZKG* 117.2-3 (2006): 169-96; Morales, *La théologie*, 358-89; Karmann, *Meletius*, 193-305.

The other document resulting from the synod was the so-called Catholic Letter (*Epistula catholica*), which outlined the guidelines for reconciliation with "heterodox" bishops; see Ayres, *Nicaea*, 173-74; Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 96-97. For the text of the letter and discussion on it, see M. Tetz, "Ein enzyklisches Schreiben der Synode von Alexandrien (362)," *ZNW* 79 (1988): 262-81. The identification of this document, however, is disputed. See Morales, *La théologie*, 365-74; Karmann, *Meletius*, 182-84.

79. *Pan.* 73.28.1-4; Philostorgius, *historia ecclesiastica* 5.1. See K. Spoerl, "The Schism at Antioch Since Cavallera," in *Arianism After Arius*, ed. Barnes and Williams, 101-26; Karmann, *Meletius*, 60-74, 135-49. His theological ambiguity was revealed through the course of his sermon on *Prv* 8.22; see Karmann, *Meletius*, 75-134, for a thorough discussion, and *Pan.* 73.29.1-33.5 for the text of the sermon.

80. Cf. Ath., *tomus ad Antiochenos* 5-6. See Karmann, *Meletius*, 220-51.

81. Notice the conciliatory tone taken earlier (359-361) with the Homoiousians in Ath., *epistula de synodis Arimini et Seleucia* 41. See Kopecek, *A History*, 226-27; Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 133; Martin, *Athanasius*, 529-33; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 171-77; Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 95-100; Morales, *La théologie*, 313-55; Gwynn, *The Eusebians*, 114. Other scholars view the *Tomus* as a largely divisive work: Hanson, *The Search*, 639-53; T. Elliot, "Was the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* a Pacific Document?" *JEH* 58.1 (2007): 1-8. On the difficulty of determining exactly what the Trinitarian theology of Meletius and the Meletians was, see Karmann, *Meletius*, 283-305.

the Holy Spirit, do nothing more than in words deny the Arian heresy but in thought maintain it."⁸² Ultimately the *Tomus* condemned any who would lower the Holy Spirit to the level of a creature: "and the Holy Spirit is not a creature, nor a stranger, but is proper and indivisible from the *ousia* of the Son and of the Father."⁸³ Thus for Athanasius the divinity of the Holy Spirit became a defining feature of his orthodoxy, and the language of the *Tomus* punctuated the convictions Athanasius articulated in his letters to his friend Serapion. It is unclear exactly what became of the Tropikoi, but certainly in the years that followed, the question of the Holy Spirit became an increasingly important and divisive point of contention.

Basil of Caesarea and the "Pneumatomachoi"

While we should probably consider the Tropikoi a local Egyptian phenomenon, debates over the nature and role of the Holy Spirit vis-à-vis the Father and Son erupted in Asia Minor, and those who subordinated the Spirit were denigrated by their opponents as the Pneumatomachoi, or "fighters against the Spirit."⁸⁴ Later sources also used the designation Macedonians, named after Macedonius, the one-time bishop of Constantinople and Homoiousian partisan.⁸⁵ Who these Macedonians were, however, and why they were identified as such are unresolved questions that have been disputed in modern scholarship.⁸⁶ Richard Hanson perhaps describes best what to make of them:

82. Ath., *tom.* 3. Cf. Socr., *h.e.* 3.7.2. On the question of Pneumatology derived from the *Tomus*, see Morales, *La théologie*, 138–41, and for why such a strong assertion was made in the document, Karmann, *Meletius*, 207–9.

83. Ath., *tom.* 5.

84. For the background of the so-called Pneumatomachoi and their derivatives, see P. Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi," in *Paulys-Real Encyclopädie, neue Bearbeitung* 21.1 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1951), 1066–1101, who presents a thorough study of the various attestations and understandings by ancient authors of the terms Pneumatomachoi and Macedonians. See also Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*; M. Haykin, "ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΣΙΛΩΤΑΝΟΣ: Silvanus of Tarsus and his View of the Spirit," *VC* 36.3 (1982): 261–74; idem, *The Spirit of God*, 9–49.

85. For example, Gregory of Nyssa, *de Spiritu sancto contra Macedonianos*; Socr., *h.e.* 2.45.1–7; Soz., *h.e.* 4.27.1–7.

86. The designation "Macedonians" did not appear in sources before 378,

But it would be a mistake to imagine that Macedonianism ever was a neatly defined doctrinal system, nor even that at any point it could be determined who was Macedonian and who not. It was more like a diverse series of protests by people who did not know what was happening in the field of developing doctrine, who had no integrated position to maintain but had a confused suspicion that the pro-Nicenes were going beyond Scripture.⁸⁷

All sources prior to 378, including the writings of Epiphanius, vilified as Pneumatomachoi those who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. And if the voice of orthodoxy against the Tropikoi was Athanasius, then perhaps the same can be said of Basil of Caesarea⁸⁸ against the Pneumatomachoi.⁸⁹ The key opponent

and was not connected specifically with the Pneumatomachoi until 383; cf. Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi," 1069-73. On the differing views of who these "Macedonians" were, again see Meinhold's article, which does well in tracing the actual history of Macedonius's career, especially with respect to his leadership within the Homoiousian party, and how in later usage his name became intermingled with the Pneumatomachoi. He argues that the term "Macedonian" was a twofold designation: first as an ecclesiastical/political moniker for the Homoiousian partisans of the deposed Macedonius, then later as a dogmatic position associated with the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit (which was the view of Macedonius as described by Soz., *h.e.* 4.27.1-7). Shapland, *The Letters*, 21-34, identifies the Macedonians as a group of conservative bishops led by Eleusius of Cyzicus, which was condemned at the Council of Constantinople, whose precursors (led by Basil of Ancyra and including Macedonius of Constantinople and Eustathius of Sebaste) had made recourse to *homoiousion* as a theological definition to describe the relationship between Father and Son. Simonetti, *La crisi*, 362-67, situates them (Homoiousians) locally at Constantinople and Asia Minor in connection to Macedonius, but also suggests a possible connection to the "Tropikoi" refuted by Athanasius.

87. Hanson, *The Search*, 766.

88. For the life of Basil, see P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 20 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994).

89. See Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 24-49, 104-69. On Basil's Pneumatology, see H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto: Der Beitrag des Basilii zum Abschluß des trinitarischen Dogmas*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); Hanson, *The Search*, 772-80; Simonetti, *La crisi*, 480-501; V. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilii von Cäsarea: Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 66 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), especially 130-269; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 211-21.

in this phase of the controversy was Basil's one-time friend and mentor, Eustathius of Sebaste, who was originally a Homoiousian partisan in the milieu of Basil of Ancyra and had become bishop of Sebaste by 357.⁹⁰ He attended the synod at Ancyra that year in this capacity, but was subsequently deposed in favor of Meletius, restored by his supporters, deposed again by the Homoian synod of Constantinople in 360, and restored again in 366.⁹¹ Basil vigorously defended Eustathius as orthodox for many years, but gradually their relationship deteriorated, with a final rift occurring by 374, catalyzed by Basil's support of Eustathius's ecclesiastical rival Meletius and by the question of the Holy Spirit.⁹² Up to about 372/73, Eustathius had remained

On the development of Basil's Trinitarian theology, see Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*; B. Sesboué, *Saint Basile et la Trinité, un acte théologique au IV^e siècle: Le rôle de Basile de Césarée dans l'élaboration de la doctrine et du langage trinitaires* (Paris: Desclée, 1998), especially 139–48, 166–69, on the Holy Spirit; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 187–221; S. Hildebrand, *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007); M. DelCogliano, *Basil of Caesarea's Anti-Eunomian Theory of Names: Christian Theology and Late-Antique Philosophy in the Fourth-Century Trinitarian Controversy*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

One must be cautious, however, in making the assumption that Basil was directly influenced by Athanasius and represented a continuation of the Alexandrian's theology. See M. Troiano, "Il *Contra Eunomium* III di Basilio di Cesarea e le *epistolae ad Serapionem* I–IV di Atanasio di Alexandria," *Augustinianum* 41 (2001): 59–91. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 221, suggests: "... modern scholarship has failed to demonstrate with certainty any detailed engagement with Athanasius' theology on the part of Basil." Also see M. DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea on Prov 8:22 and the Sources of Pro-Nicene Theology," *JTS* 59.1 (2008): 183–90; idem, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3," *JTS* 61.2 (2010): 644–58. Contrast, however, with Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 140: "Evidently, the young Cappadocian author, finding his first theological treatise a difficult endeavour, turned to the work of the respected Alexandrian bishop for inspiration and direction."

90. Philost., *h.e.* 4.12; Socr., *h.e.* 2.42.1–43.6; Soz., *h.e.* 4.15.1, 4.24.9. See Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi," 1081–86, for a thorough discussion of Eustathius's role in the theological dispute.

91. On Eustathius, see *Pan.* 73.23.4; Socr., *h.e.* 2.43.1–6; Soz., *h.e.* 3.14.31–37; also J. Gribomont, "Eustathe de Sébaste," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire* 4.2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1961), 1708–12; idem, "Eustathe de Sébaste," in *DHGE* 16 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967), 26–33; C. Frazee, "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebaste and Basil of Caesarea," *The Catholic Historical Review* 66.1 (1980): 16–33.

92. For the progressive deterioration of their relationship, see Bas., *ep.* 79,

comfortable in his ambiguity on this issue, as he had at the Synod of Lampsacus in 364, where he expressed his tepid position: "I neither choose to name the Holy Spirit as God, nor do I dare to call him a creature."⁹³ At Sebaste, however, Eustathius apparently had Pneumatomachoi among his disciples, who would ultimately sway his views their way.

Meanwhile, Basil had his own struggle with suspicions and accusations of impropriety and heresy that emerged both from within his own circle and from beyond.⁹⁴ On the one hand, certain supporters of Eustathius in Basil's monastic community may have played an initial role in this, but, on the other hand, it was precisely his continued friendship and association with Eustathius in the early 370s that made Basil's orthodoxy suspect.⁹⁵ Basil was stuck between two camps, both accusing him of some form of heresy. So in 373 he made a last-ditch effort to persuade his detractors that Eustathius was orthodox by meeting with his former mentor and securing from him a signed statement of faith based on the Nicene Creed and perhaps modeled after the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*.⁹⁶ In his efforts, however, to secure ecclesiastical peace, Basil proposed an official synod to ratify this confession, which was apparently the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.⁹⁷ The demands placed on Eustathius by his one-time pupil were too much, so he reneged on his signed confession and severed his relationship with Basil.⁹⁸ He also began a smear campaign against Basil, accusing him of holding Sabellian and Apollinarian views and innovating doctrines.⁹⁹ Basil, however, did not respond at that time.¹⁰⁰ Eustathius seems to

99, 119, 121, 125, 128, 130, 131, 216, 223, 250, 251. See Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 26–49; Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 233–69; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 225–26.

93. Socr., *h.e.* 2.45.6.

94. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 225. Associates of Eustathius accused Basil of having a suspect Pneumatology.

95. Bas., *ep.* 99, 119, 128. See Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 195–96; Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 29–40.

96. Bas., *ep.* 125, 130, 244. On the Nicene Creed as Basil's standard of orthodoxy, see Bas., *ep.* 113, 204; Ayres, *Nicaea*, 211, n. 72.

97. Bas., *ep.* 244.2.

98. Bas., *ep.* 130.1, 244.2–3. On the break in their relationship, see Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung*, 195–212.

99. Bas., *ep.* 129.1, 131.1, 224.3.

100. Bas., *ep.* 223.1, 244.4. Once he broke his silence, he wrote numerous

have concluded that the Spirit was a gift, and that the gift and the giver of that gift were not worthy to receive the same honor.¹⁰¹ As the powerful leader among the Pneumatomachoi,¹⁰² Eustathius and his followers gained significant ground and support for their position, and they essentially split Anatolia along theological lines, though their influence remained strongest mainly in the northern regions.¹⁰³

The Spirit and the *Ancoratus*

Around the same time Basil's relationship with Eustathius was rapidly falling apart, Epiphanius was asked by Christians in Pamphylia to write to them about the orthodox faith, especially in regard to the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁴ It is not impossible that the Pneumatomachoi in their community were connected to Eustathius, as they were even present in nearby Cappadocia.¹⁰⁵ Epiphanius could not help but respond to their pleas, because for him the work of the Holy Spirit was central to the saving work of Christ and to the revelation of God's economy, and thus a proper understanding of the Spirit as part of the divine Godhead was essential to being an orthodox Christian. In *Panarion* 74, written two or three years after the *Ancoratus*, Epiphanius specifically discussed two distinct groups whose constituents denied the standing of the Holy Spirit as part of the divine Godhead. The first belonged to the Arian variety, those who claimed that

letters to defend himself, as he prepared his ultimate response with *liber de Spiritu Sancto*. For a list of these letters, see Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 43, n. 191.

101. Bas., *Spir.* 24.57.

102. At least according to Basil's polemic in *ep.* 263.3.

103. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 215–16; Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 40–41. Their success can be attributed in part to Eustathius's alliance with his former theological enemies among the Homoian party; cf. Bas., *ep.* 226.2, 237.2, 251.3; Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 205–6. Even before the full break between Basil and Eustathius, Basil wrote to the church in Cilicia about his concern over the theology of the Pneumatomachoi, which would indicate a wider presence in many parts of Anatolia. Bas., *ep.* 113, 114. See Haykin, "ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΣΙΛΟΤΑΝΟΣ," 268–70, and idem, "And Who is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letter to the Church at Tarsus," *VC* 41.4 (1987): 377–85.

104. In addition, Epiphanius explicitly mentioned in *Pan.* 69.28.1 that he sent his *Anc.* to Christians in Pisidia as well.

105. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 213; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 69.

Christ was a perfect creation, begotten timelessly, but "there was a time when he was not," and ultimately drew a parallel conclusion about the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁶ The other group, however, he identified as those who were entirely orthodox in their view of the Son, but blasphemed the Holy Spirit; and it seems that in the case of the *Ancoratus*, the heretics of concern were of the latter sort.¹⁰⁷ When Epiphanius composed *Panarion* 74, he quoted a lengthy excerpt from the *Ancoratus* (65.1–73.9), which in fact constituted the majority of this particular entry. In his set-up of the passage, Epiphanius explained why he was offering a quotation from his earlier work: "... that I might not assume a burden here, I will provide what I have already said in my long explanation concerning the faith written to those in Pamphylia, in opposition to those blaspheming the Holy Spirit, for the instruction of the reader and for the delight of those deemed worthy of the Holy Spirit."¹⁰⁸ Kösters sees the reproduced text as an indication that in the years between the composition of both works, Epiphanius continued to draw on the same argumentation about the divinity of the Holy Spirit and that his Pneumatology developed slowly.¹⁰⁹ For Epiphanius, the Holy Spirit is worthy of equal praise and worship, is "from God," and "is God" in the Trinity.¹¹⁰ There were, however, at least two noticeable shifts in Epiphanius's language of the Holy Spirit between the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion*. The first shift was the explicit assertion that the Spirit is *homoousios* with Father and Son, and the second was the use of *hypostasis* to describe each of the Persons of the Trinity.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, Epiphanius's reflections in the *Ancoratus* must be considered the earliest, if not foundational,

106. *Pan.* 74.1.1–2. Here he connected the Pneumatomachoi specifically to the "Semi-Arians" led by Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea (those who were of the Homoiousian position), whom he had refuted in the previous entry, *Pan.* 73.

107. Epiphanius also mentioned and refuted the Pneumatomachoi of this type in *Pan.* 74.14.4–8. Hauschild, *Die Pneumatomachen*, 64, identified these with the theological circle of Eustathius; see also Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 65. And/or they may have been supporters of Meletius, as identified in *Pan.* 73.34.4.

108. *Pan.* 74.1.5.

109. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 70–76.

110. *Anc.* 6.6–10, 9.3, 14.5–6, 67.1–6, 70.1–2, 118.1–3; *Pan.* 74.11.6–13.9.

111. *Pan.* 73.34.2, 74.11.2. This shift may even have occurred while Epipha-

articulations of his theology of the Holy Spirit, and his thinking was rooted in the one-*hypostasis* theological tradition.

As the notes and translation of the *Ancoratus* in this volume will show, Epiphanius represented a continuation of the legacy of Athanasius but also a transition toward the Trinitarian formula that is most commonly associated with Basil. Both Basil of Caesarea and Epiphanius were simultaneously engaged in the debates on the Holy Spirit, though their results exhibited different approaches. We cannot know what, if any, interaction Epiphanius may have had with Basil in the early years of the 370s. But by early 377, Epiphanius and Basil certainly had engaged in some correspondence, and it is clear that they shared a common concern over the standing of the Holy Spirit, as Basil wrote in response to a letter from Epiphanius: "we are able to add nothing to the faith according to Nicaea, not the smallest thing, save the praise of the Holy Spirit."¹¹² Basil had dedicated his *liber de Spiritu Sancto*¹¹³ to Amphilochius in 375, so his particular response to the challenge of the Pneumatomachoi was now in writing. Basil covered a wide range of issues that ultimately pointed to and implied the divinity of the Spirit (though he never explicitly stated that the Holy Spirit is God),¹¹⁴ including arguments from the Spirit's worthiness of worship and glory, together with the Father and Son, the names given to the Spirit in Scripture, the role of the Spirit in sanctification, and the revelatory and illuminating work of the Spirit in the life of the believer which leads to the Son and the Father.¹¹⁵ Basil published his

nus was composing the *Anc.*; compare *Anc.* 6.5 with 81.9. Cf. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 72–76, 298–306, 348–70. In the *Anc.*, Epiphanius rather used the term ἐνυπόστατος/ν in his description of the individual, real existence of each of the Persons of the Trinity, together constituting one *hypostasis*. See footnote 9 on page 67 for further discussion of the term.

112. Bas., *ep.* 258.2 (dated early 377). It is also possible that Epiphanius bore some suspicion concerning Basil's orthodoxy; cf. Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie*, 45, n. 68.

113. On the contextual backdrop in which Basil wrote this text, see Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 104–13.

114. See Gregory of Nazianzus, *orationes* 43.68, for an explanation of why he did not.

115. Basil earlier wrote *adversus Eunomium libri tres*, in which he articulated some aspects of his Pneumatology, particularly in the third book. M. DelCo-

work in the interval between the composition of the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion*, and there certainly must be further consideration about the potential influence of Basil on Epiphanius's convictions on Trinitarian theology (or perhaps vice versa?). The *Ancoratus*, however, reflected Epiphanius's own thinking and represented another important voice in the articulation of a developing orthodox theology of the Holy Spirit in the years leading up to the Council of Constantinople.¹¹⁶

gliano and A. Radde-Gallwitz, *St. Basil of Caesarea, Against Eunomius*, FOTC 122 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 53–55, emphasize on the part of Basil a certain reticence and ambiguity about the exact understanding of the Holy Spirit, especially about the Spirit's mode of existence. Bas., *Eun.* 3.6, 3.7: "So, then, why is it shocking that we are not ashamed to confess our ignorance even in the case of the Holy Spirit, but we still render him the glorification for which there is undeniable testimony? The teaching transmitted by the scripture sufficiently communicates to us that he is beyond creation," and, "For it is a mark of a pious mind to beware of attributing to the Holy Spirit those things that the holy scriptures omit in silence, and to be convinced that experience and exact comprehension of him is reserved for us in the subsequent age..." (trans. DelCogliano and Radde-Gallwitz, *Against Eunomius*, 194–96).

116. Laminksi, *Der Heilige Geist*, 173, mentions only briefly Epiphanius's part in the development of "orthodox" Pneumatology, and he sees Epiphanius largely in agreement with the theology of Athanasius.

An underappreciated thinker on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is Didymus the Blind, whose *Liber Didymi de Spiritu sancto* was an important contribution to the developing Pneumatology of the Alexandrian tradition, with a particular focus on demonstrating how the substance of the Holy Spirit must be the same as that of the Father and Son. See L. Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*, ed. D. Twomey and J. Rutherford (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010), 57–72, and the introduction in DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 31–47. The dating of the composition of the treatise is disputed, either sometime in the late 370s or, as Ayres, "The Holy Spirit," 66, and DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind," argue, in the late 350s or early 360s. For the Pneumatology of Didymus, see L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Ageule, Traité du Saint-Esprit. Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes et Index*, SC 386 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 55–92.

Another author was Cyril of Jerusalem, who articulated specific views on the Holy Spirit, especially in his *catecheses illuminandorum* 16–17. See J. Day, "Cyril of Jerusalem on the Holy Spirit," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*,

APOLLINARIAN CHRISTOLOGY

The theology of Apollinarius¹¹⁷ and his followers was another issue that formed part of the backdrop of the *Ancoratus*, and Kösters identifies in particular the conflict over Apollinarius's theology in Antioch as a crucial point of context for Epiphanius's own theological development, namely, the transition from a one-*hypostasis* to a three-*hypostaseis*, one-*ousia* theology.¹¹⁸

ed. Twomey and Rutherford, 73–85, who makes an interesting suggestion, that Cyril may have been responding to a heretical movement in Jerusalem that may have been an earlier version of the Pneumatomachoi than that against which Athanasius wrote. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 28–29, views Cyril as evidence that the debate on the Spirit was already taking place in the 340s. See also Hanson, *The Search*, 398–413. Another eastern theologian to consider as part of these early discussions on the Holy Spirit is Apollinarius of Laodicea (cf. Soz., *h.e.* 6.22.1–4), as demonstrated by K. Spoerl, “Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit,” *StPatr* 37 (2001): 571–92.

An important western theologian to examine is Hilary of Poitiers; cf. Hanson, *The Search*, 459–506, especially 502–5 on the Spirit, and Ayres, *Nicaea*, 184–85. We must also add Marius Victorinus; cf. Hanson, *The Search*, 531–56, 747–48.

On the “conclusion” of the controversy over the Pneumatomachoi, see Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 170–201, especially for the importance of the roles of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa in articulating the “orthodox” position. Also see Simonetti, *La crisi*, 480–501, for a useful summary of theological developments and primary source references. Many other important pro-Nicene authors wrote specifically on the theology of the person of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, including Ambrose and Augustine.

117. For a summary of Apollinarius's life and career, see K. Spoerl, *A Study of the Κατὰ Μέρος Πιστις by Apollinarius of Laodicea* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Toronto, Toronto, 1991), 6–53.

118. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 51–62. In particular, *Anc.* 76–80 discussed the theology related to Apollinarius. For general introductions to Apollinarian theology, see H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1904); C. Raven, *Apollinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church* (Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge, 1923); E. Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea, Forschungen zu Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 379–401.

More specific studies can be found in R. Greer, “The Man from Heaven: Paul's Last Adam and Apollinaris' Christ,” in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 165–82; Spoerl, *A Study*; eadem, “Apollinarius and the Response to Early Arian Christology,” *StPatr* 26 (1993): 421–27; eadem, “Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan

At the time Epiphanius wrote the *Ancoratus*, he did not openly regard Apollinarius as a heretic, and perhaps even not at all.¹¹⁹ When he did attack those who “cast aside the mind of Christ,” he identified them specifically in the *Ancoratus* as Dimoerites, those who “wage war” on the full humanity of Christ.¹²⁰ Even in *Panarion* 77 (composed sometime in late 376 or thereafter), Epiphanius seemed to imply that some of the false teachings attributed to Apollinarius may have been the result of his students misconstruing his teaching, though this may have been more a rhetorical strategy on the part of Epiphanius: “for we were saying that his pupils who came to us from him did not understand the profundities <proclaimed> by such a learned man and intelligent teacher, that they had fabricated these things, not having learned them from him.”¹²¹ The specific argumentation, however, against Apollinarius in the *Panarion* echoed points made in the *Ancoratus*, which meant that in 374, Epiphanius was already in conflict with theological ideas that

Tradition,” *JTS* 45.2 (1994): 545–68; B. Daley, “Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa’s Anti-Apollinarian Christology,” *StPatr* 32 (1997), 87–95; Spoerl, “Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit”; B. Daley, “‘Heavenly Man’ and ‘Eternal Christ’: Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior,” *J ECS* 10.4 (2002): 469–88.

119. And indeed, if Reinhard Hübner is correct, Epiphanius actually had used as a source for the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion* the Pseudo-Athanasian *Contra Sabellianos*, arguably written by Apollinarius. See R. Hübner, “Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (*Panarion*, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata: Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*,” *ZKG* 90 (1979): 201–20; idem, “Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, und Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*,” *ZKG* 92.2/3 (1981): 325–33; idem, *Die Schrift des Apollinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilios von Caesarea*, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 30 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 1–46. See also Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra*, 220–27, who had earlier suggested Basil as the author, but changed his mind on the basis of work by Hübner. He also, however, does not agree with Hübner that Apollinarius is the author, and for him the question remains open.

120. For example, *Anc.* 13.8 (though here the text does include “Apollinarians,” but this may be a later interpolation) and 63.6.

121. *Pan.* 77.2.1–5; 77.36.1–6. Raven, *Apollinarianism*, 98–103, suggests that all manner of Christological error was attributed, sometimes incorrectly, to Apollinarius: “And yet when we study his own works and character we discover not only that he is transparently sincere and singularly clear and consistent, but that he repeatedly anathematizes and ridicules the errors which he is accused of having initiated” (101).

he later attacked by name as Apollinarian. Thus Epiphanius's explicit turn against Apollinarius himself must have occurred sometime between the composition of these two texts. At one point during this interim, Epiphanius was visited on Cyprus by some pupils of Apollinarius, who related some rather alarming Christological and anthropological views, again apparently distortions of Apollinarius's own teachings: (1) Christ had brought his body down with him from on high;¹²² (2) Christ did not assume a human intellectual soul; and (3) Christ's body was *homousios* with the Godhead.¹²³ Such disturbing ideas apparently necessitated a synod, and the minutes of the proceedings were then forwarded to Athanasius, who wrote a letter in response condemning these heretical views.¹²⁴ Ultimately, Epiphanius had little recourse but to condemn openly Apollinarius in the *Panarion* as a heretic, though not without terrible sadness and regret because Apollinarius had been "ever beloved among the orthodox and ordered among the best."¹²⁵ For Epiphanius, the Christology of Apollinarius resulted in the denial of the full humanity of Christ, which would then render the life, death, and resurrection of Christ inefficacious for human salvation.¹²⁶

122. Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 390–401, offers a succinct study of the development of this particular idea.

123. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 51–62, for a careful examination of Epiphanius's opposition to Apollinarian doctrine; and Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 379–401, for an excellent discussion of the theology of these teachings.

124. Epiphanius mentioned the synod specifically in *Pan.* 77.2.5, and he also included the letter by Athanasius (Ath., *Epistula ad Epictetum*) in 77.3.1–13.6.

125. *Pan.* 77.24.8. Cf. *Pan.* 77.19.5–7. Indeed, it seems the problem Epiphanius would ultimately have with Apollinarius was in the realm of Christology, not Trinitarian theology per se. Spoerl, *A Study*, does well in demonstrating that the development of Apollinarius's Christology, which would become the focal point of attacks against him as a heretic, was subsequent to his anti-Arian and anti-Marcellan Trinitarian theology, for which he would have been considered orthodox by the likes of Epiphanius. She also argues throughout her work that Apollinarius's theology represented a "melding of the mia- and dyohypostatic trinitarian positions that proved so momentous for later theology" (373), in other words, that Apollinarius pioneered a sort of theological *via media* between the Arian/Eusebian and the Marcellan views and ultimately laid the foundation for what would become the "orthodoxy" articulated by Basil. The affinity between Athanasius's and Apollinarius's Pneumatology (see Spoerl, "Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit") again supports the idea that Epiphanius could have viewed Apollinarius as orthodox in his Trinitarian theology.

126. *Anc.* 77–79; *Pan.* 77.19.1; 77.23.4–6.

Another relevant incident that took place during the period between the composition of the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion* was Epiphanius's own visit to Antioch in the midst of the Meletian schism to mediate between Vitalis (who was consecrated by Apollinarius) and Paulinus, two of the contenders for the disputed bishopric.¹²⁷ Epiphanius described how upon arrival at Antioch, he refrained from establishing communion with either man, especially because Vitalis had accused Paulinus of being a Sabelian.¹²⁸ After some questioning by Epiphanius, Paulinus ultimately proved himself orthodox by presenting a signed confession of faith appended to the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (though it must be emphasized that Paulinus at this time maintained a one-*hypostasis* doctrine).¹²⁹ The fact that Epiphanius established communion with Paulinus during this visit to Antioch must also imply that for Epiphanius the one-*hypostasis* or the three-*hypostaseis* doctrine was not the benchmark for orthodoxy, and in fact he affirmed the former over the latter (or at least his thinking was in flux).¹³⁰ Paulinus in turn accused Vitalis of denying that Christ had become a perfect man.¹³¹ In the ensuing questioning, Epiphanius initially found that Vitalis confessed that Christ "assumed a perfect man,"

127. Epiphanius provided the narrative of these events in *Pan.* 77.20.1–24.5. Cf. Soz., *h.e.* 6.25.1–14. The date for this attempt at mediation was sometime in late 376 or early 377. The need for arbitration resulted from the break in relations between Paulinus and Vitalis, which was catalyzed by the *Per filium* letter of Damasus that cautioned against Apollinarian doctrine. Vitalis, who in 375 had made a profession of faith acceptable to Damasus in 375, rejected the new conditions for communion outlined in the letter and severed his ties with Paulinus. He was then consecrated bishop of Antioch by Apollinarius. See Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*, 50–53; Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 66–70; Hanson, *The Search*, 658–59; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 55, n. 228, and 61, n. 267; Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 112.

For Epiphanius's role in the Meletian schism: Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 57–91. On the Meletian schism itself, see F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe–Ve siècle)* (Paris: Picard, 1905); Spoerl, "The Schism"; Karmann, *Meletius*.

128. *Pan.* 77.20.6–7. That is, because Paulinus was in communion with the followers of the theology of Marcellus of Ancyra; cf. Bas., *ep.* 268.4–5. Furthermore, Spoerl, "Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit," 583–85, argues that Paulinus asserted a three-*prosopa* formula.

129. In *Pan.* 77.21.1–9, Epiphanius included a copy of the statement composed by Paulinus that now appears in Ath., *tom.* 11. See Tetz, "Über nikäische," 218–21; Amidon, "Paulinus' Subscription," 68–73.

130. Cf. *Anc.* 6, 81.

131. *Pan.* 77.22.2.

with true human flesh from the Virgin Mary without the seed of a man and with a human soul. But when Epiphanius asked, "Did Christ who came assume a mind (νοῦν)?" Vitalis "at once denied this, saying, 'no.'"¹³² Vitalis's understanding of a "perfect man" was one composed of "flesh, soul, and divinity in the place of a *nous*."¹³³ Thus the Apollinarian issue came to the fore.

In the continuing discussion Vitalis was no longer the direct conversation partner, but rather certain unnamed Apollinarians, who were divided among themselves and not entirely certain about what they believed. When he asked them what they thought the *nous* was, they claimed that the *nous* was the same thing as the *pneuma*.¹³⁴ He tried, however, to persuade them through an interpretation of 1 Corinthians 14.15 ("I will sing with my mind; I will sing with my spirit") that in fact they were not the same.¹³⁵ From the same verse Epiphanius asserted that the *nous* is not an actual thing, that is, a *hypostasis*, but rather it is the "movement (κίνησις) of our whole *hypostasis*."¹³⁶ Earlier in the *Ancoratus*, Epiphanius argued against the notion that the *nous* was a *hypostasis*:

So they err: for if a mind is the spirit and the spirit a mind, as they also believe, but the soul is another <*hypostasis*> along with the mind and along with the spirit, no longer are two *hypostaseis* being combined into a man into one *hypostasis*, no longer is the soul alone enhypostatic and the body enhypostatic, but we find then four: the mind is one *hypostasis*, the soul another *hypostasis*, the spirit another *hypostasis*, the body another *hypostasis*.¹³⁷

The proper anthropological view was that the entire human being, necessarily including all of these things, was itself the *hy-*

132. *Pan.* 77.22.1–23.1. See Raven, *Apollinarianism*, 139–42; Spoerl, *A Study*, 39–51, on Vitalis.

133. *Pan.* 77.23.2.

134. *Pan.* 77.23.4–24.5; also *Anc.* 77.4–78.9. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 56–57, 289–90. Greer, "The Man from Heaven," 169: "Identifying 'spirit' in 1 Corinthians 15:45 with 'mind,' Apollinaris concludes that the man from heaven has God (the Word) as the mind that governs the (irrational) soul and the body." Raven, *Apollinarianism*, 189: "In his account of the nature of Christ, Apollinarius employs, as we have observed, two terms, 'mind' and 'spirit,' as equally descriptive of the element in man which in the Incarnate was replaced by his Godhead."

135. *Pan.* 77.24.1; cf. *Anc.* 76–77.

136. *Pan.* 77.24.2.

137. *Anc.* 77.5. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 291–94.

postasis.¹³⁸ "So what is a man? Soul, body, mind, and as much as there is any another thing."¹³⁹

Epiphanius insisted in both the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion* that just as Christ had assumed human soul and body, so too did he a human mind: "for the *Logos* who came possessed these things, body, soul, mind, and all that is a man, apart from sin, apart from defect, according to what has been written, 'he has been tempted according to all things as a man, apart from sin' [Heb 4.15]."¹⁴⁰ One of the main objections, however, that Apollinarius and his followers believed about Christ's assumption of a human mind was that if Christ had indeed assumed it, he also would have assumed the sinfulness resulting from a fickle, unstable, and changing mind.¹⁴¹ The Apollinarian doctrine therefore necessitated the presence of the *Logos* in the Incarnation in lieu of the human *nous*, thus making Christ immune to sin.¹⁴² For Epiphanius, the assumption of the human mind did not necessitate or make automatic the assumption of human sin, because it was precisely the divine *Logos*, with the assumed human *nous*, which made human sin in Christ impossible.¹⁴³ Epiphanius also countered the argument made by the Apollinarians by emphasizing the fact that in the economy, Christ had assumed flesh and Scripture was clear that "the works of the flesh are manifest" (Gal 5.19). But Christ incarnate in human flesh did not sin, and again it was the *Logos* that made the difference:

For the God-*Logos* who came forth from on high from the Father, who consented to come to be in flesh, was guiding his vessel; and if he was wishing to check it from all useless, fleshly action, he was able. And if

138. On the use of *hypostasis* in Incarnational theology, see M. Richard, "L'Introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'Incarnation," *Mélanges de science religieuse* (1945): 5-32, 243-70. He discusses the Antioch episode briefly (10-11).

139. *Anc.* 78.5.

140. *Anc.* 77.5; quotation from *Pan.* 77.27.2.

141. Cf. *Anc.* 79; *Pan.* 77.26.1-27.9. Apollinarius, *epistula ad Diocaesarienses* 2.256.5-7: "The Word did not become flesh by taking on a human mind, a mind that is changeable and subject to filthy thoughts, but by being a divine unchangeable heavenly mind" (trans. Spoerl, "Apollinarius and Early Arian Christology," 424).

142. *Anc.* 80.1-8.

143. *Anc.* 79.1-5. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 294-98.

he was wishing, he was allowing it. But he was allowing it in the bodily uses that were rational and befitting to his divinity.¹⁴⁴

With the assumption of human flesh, Christ grew in age and wisdom, hungered, thirsted, wept, grew weary, and of course suffered, but he was also able to resist temptation and not succumb to sin.¹⁴⁵ With respect to the mind, Epiphanius then drew what he thought was a logical conclusion:

For truly possessing the mind, just as he truly was possessing the entire Incarnation, [the mind] was not being directed toward irrational desires, nor was he doing or reckoning the things of the flesh as we do. But as God, who came to be in true flesh from the Virgin Mary, he was acting with flesh and with soul and with mind and with the entire vessel, he who dwelt with the race of men, from on high, from the Father, enhypostatic God-*Logos*.¹⁴⁶

Epiphanius repeated a similar thought in the *Panarion*:

So as the *Logos* who came was <not> defective in the flesh, although possessing human flesh, neither has he conceived in his mind things not suitable to his divinity. But the Lord who came accomplished these things that were rational for the flesh and soul and human mind, in order that he might not disturb the ordering of the true incarnate *parousia*.¹⁴⁷

In the economy, Christ assumed true human flesh and a true human mind, both of which were susceptible to sin, but unlike the rest of humanity, the divine *Logos* in the mystery of the Incarnation assumed all that is in a man but did not sin. The Apollinarians held an utterly pessimistic opinion of the human mind, while Epiphanius maintained a more balanced perspective: "for our mind was not produced in us for sinning, but for examining the points on both sides of all matters that we consider and for doing righteousness (and its opposite)."¹⁴⁸ Again, this was a view he also emphasized earlier in the *Ancoratus*: "For

¹⁴⁴. *Anc.* 79.3.

¹⁴⁵. In fact, some Apollinarians in the *Panarion* (77.15.3–18.16) apparently claimed that Christ's body was in fact *different* from the rest of humanity, and hence the accusation that they believed Christ brought his body down from heaven.

¹⁴⁶. *Anc.* 79.4.

¹⁴⁸. *Pan.* 77.27.4.

¹⁴⁷. *Pan.* 77.26.6.

God established the mind, which the Scripture has been accustomed to call 'heart,' 'guide' as it says, and driver of the entire vessel, discerner of the good and the bad, scrutinizer of the things springing up in us."¹⁴⁹

Another Apollinarian idea Epiphanius refuted in both texts was rooted in their misinterpretation of 1 Corinthians 2.16 ("we have the mind of Christ"), a text which they used to assert that the "mind of Christ" was something other than the human *nous*, and therefore that the *nous* in Christ was different from that of humanity.¹⁵⁰ In his confrontation with the Apollinarians in the *Panarion*, Epiphanius argued that the proper understanding of the "mind of Christ" was that it was not a hypostatic thing, but an alignment of the mind: "for in fact every pious person lives not according to their human mind, but according to that of Christ, that which is filled with understanding by Christ, that which considers Christ in righteousness, that which lives in Christ by confession, that which is saved through Christ in righteous dealing."¹⁵¹ Thus Paul could claim in the verse stated above that believers have the "mind of Christ," because it was not a thing that replaced the human mind.¹⁵² Epiphanius made a similar assertion in the *Ancoratus*: "But if they had their own [mind] along with the mind of Christ, they were being filled full of both, on the one hand the mind of Christ, which is able to bring improvement, on the other hand their own [mind], which thinks rightly."¹⁵³ Epiphanius also argued that the human *nous* itself was not a *hypostasis*, but rather an *energeia*, what he had called the "movement of our whole *hypostasis*."¹⁵⁴ This meant that the possession of the human mind and the "mind of Christ" were not mutually exclusive, as if the human being could not accommodate both. Indeed, both man and the incarnate Christ could and did possess both a human mind and the "mind of Christ":

149. *Anc.* 76.6.

150. *Pan.* 77.31.1-6; cf. *Anc.* 76.

151. *Pan.* 77.34.1. Cf. *Anc.* 76; *Pan.* 77.34.1-6. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 58-59, 284-90.

152. *Pan.* 77.34.3.

153. *Anc.* 76.1.

154. *Pan.* 77.24.2, 77.34.5.

For if the Apostle, who possessed by nature his own human mind and that [of Christ] by participation in the gift, charism, and grace, no longer was living according to his own mind, but was adorned with some guidance transcending nature, by the mind of Christ, how much more rather was the God-*Logos*!¹⁵⁵

Thus Epiphanius dismissed 1 Corinthians 2.16 as a text that in any way affirmed the Apollinarian position that the *nous* in Christ was different from that of humanity.

Epiphanius's concerns over the different implications of Apollinarian theology were precursors to the anti-Apollinarian writings of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa and to the full-blown theological debates on the Incarnation of the fifth century (though without the vocabulary of *physis*).¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, these early concerns played a significant role in the soteriological content and themes of the *Ancoratus*. Furthermore, in the aftermath of his completion of the *Ancoratus*, Epiphanius involved himself directly in the ecclesiastical and doctrinal disputes occurring in the city of Antioch, and one of the issues which ultimately led him to favor Paulinus over and against Vitalis as the legitimate orthodox bishop was the ongoing developments in the theology of the Incarnation. These circumstances also compelled him to connect the flawed ideas of the unnamed heretics in *Ancoratus* 75–80 explicitly to Apollinarius and his pupils in *Panarion* 77.

BEFORE THE ORIGENIST CONTROVERSY

Though the Origenist Controversy would not erupt until the 390s, two decades after the composition of the *Ancoratus*; nevertheless, Epiphanius set the stage early in his episcopal career for his heresiological campaign against those who he thought were guilty of embracing the theology of Origen. While the fullest expression of Epiphanius's construction, polemic, and refutation of Origen came in the form of *Panarion* 64, he already anticipated in the *Ancoratus* some of the core issues that troubled him

155. *Pan.* 77.35.2.

156. See Greer, "The Man from Heaven," 174–80; Daley, "Divine Transcendence"; idem, "Heavenly Man," 478–88, and Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 401–8, 445–58, for how Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa argued and wrote against Apollinarius.

about the Alexandrian. Jon Dechow's *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* is a thorough examination of Epiphanius's construction of Origenism and the specific theological accusations he made in *Panarion* 64.¹⁵⁷ This study is also the only monograph-length study in English dedicated to Epiphanius. Dechow connects Epiphanius's anti-Origenism to his educational background characterized by a "monastic intransigence" that was hostile toward theological speculation and mysticism.¹⁵⁸ Epiphanius made clear in the *Panarion* that Origen had become corrupted by classical Greek culture and its philosophical traditions, which he had then tried to apply to his reading and interpretation of Scripture: "Thus you, Origen, your mind blinded by your Greek education, have vomited poison for your followers and have become noxious food for them, by which you yourself have been harmed while harming more people."¹⁵⁹ In the *Ancoratus*, Epiphanius was emphatic about the problem of an over-allegorizing exegesis of Scripture: "Thus also concerning Paradise many people allegorize, as the insane Origen wished a fantasy rather than the truth to be introduced to life."¹⁶⁰ Ultimately, in Epiphanius's thinking, the pitfall of an allegorical reading of the Creation narrative was the removal of Adam and Eve from the realm of created matter, which in turn situated the Fall in an immaterial, incorporeal context:

This Origen introduced another mythical theory, in which allegorizing, God might ascribe appearances to men, when he [Origen] asserts that what the holy Scripture said are skin garments that God has made for Adam and his family were not skin garments: "But," he says, "this skin garment was the fleshiness of the body or the body itself." "For

157. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 243–390, identifies and discusses seven charges made by Epiphanius in *Pan.* 64: (1) the subordination of the Son to the Father, (2) the preexistence of souls, (3) Adam's loss of God's image at the Fall, (4) the "garments of skins" as allegory of the body, (5) the denial of a true bodily resurrection, (6) the allegorizing of Paradise, (7) the allegorizing of the waters above and below.

158. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 12–22, 93–124.

159. *Pan.* 64.72.9. For Epiphanius's opposition to classical culture and its connection to heresy, see Y. Kim, "Reading the *Panarion* as Collective Biography: The Heresiarch as Unholy Man," *VC* 64.4 (2010): 382–413. On the construction of Origen's life, see Lyman, "The Making of a Heretic."

160. *Anc.* 54.2.

after the disobedience," he says, "and after the eating from the tree, he [God] clad the souls in these bodies, that is, the flesh."¹⁶¹

This was the well-known "skin garments"-as-bodies problem for which Epiphanius lambasted Origen.

At the heart of Epiphanius's passionate attack on Origen's allegorical exegesis of Genesis was the effect that such readings would have on the ascetic enterprise:

For first, if another [flesh] in place of this is raised according to their argument, the judgment of God is not just, according to their myth, judging another flesh in place of the one that sinned or bearing another body for the glory of the royal inheritance of heaven in place of the body that has toiled with fasts and sleeplessness and mortifications in the name of God.¹⁶²

The monastic lifestyle was an integral aspect of Epiphanius's Christianity, and Origen's extreme separation of the original human body and the soul at the resurrection would have rendered pointless the ascetic training and discipline of the body. Indeed, in Epiphanius's estimation, Origen's view of the resurrection would have violated the very justice of God. Furthermore, Epiphanius also attacked Origen's alleged subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit: "As the Son is not able to see the Father, the Holy Spirit is also not able to see the Son."¹⁶³ Thus some of the issues Epiphanius addressed in the *Ancoratus* foreshadowed what he would write shortly thereafter, and in the *Panarion*, Epiphanius fleshed out his construction of Origen's erroneous theology in much greater detail. Both of these texts embodied in written form the heresy-hunting that Epiphanius would put into action at the end of his life during the Origenist Controversy.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ *Anc.* 62.1–2.

¹⁶² *Anc.* 87.3.

¹⁶³ *Anc.* 63.1–5. Cf. *Pan.* 64.4.3–4; Origen, *De principiis* 1.1.8. See also Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 88–89.

¹⁶⁴ Additionally, according to Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 94–104, Epiphanius in the 390s shifted his attacks on Origen and incorporated additional charges that were related to debates in which Jerome was involved.

THE PLACE OF THE *ANCORATUS* IN THE
CORPUS OF EPIPHANIUS'S WORKS

The *Ancoratus* was a text of transitions. First, as a personal transition, this was Epiphanius's first major written work, and it set the stage for his entry into the very public late fourth-century world of ecclesiastical politics, theological disputes, and heresy-hunting. The theological and thematic content of the *Ancoratus*, with its core concern of defining what was orthodox and refuting what was not, embodied in written form what Epiphanius would eventually put into action. He was not the kind of person who would sit idly by as he witnessed what he thought were threats to the true Christian faith, and it seems other Christians knew about him and sought out his expertise. Soon after he finished the long letter that was the *Ancoratus*, he must have received the urgent entreaty from the Syrian clergymen Acacius and Paul, who wrote to the bishop asking him to compose a treatise on all heresies and how to refute them. Epiphanius responded in due course with the massive *Panarion*, a work that certainly entailed much research and study, a dose of imagination, and a heaping serving of vitriol. Unfortunately, the very large presence of the *Panarion* has overshadowed the significance of the *Ancoratus*, and this translation will underscore the importance of his first treatise. In particular, comparisons between the two texts can reveal certain transitions that were taking place in Epiphanius's own thinking, especially on the question of one or three *hypostases*. We also see how Epiphanius, along with his contemporaries, struggled to formulate an orthodox understanding of the Holy Spirit and to utilize the right vocabulary and concepts to articulate the doctrine of the Trinity. Furthermore, parts of the *Ancoratus* foreshadowed the controversy that would consume the end of Epiphanius's life, the issues that arose from the theology of Origen. Thus the *Ancoratus* embodied transitions that were taking place in Epiphanius himself.

Moreover, the *Ancoratus* was also part of a larger transition that was taking place in the late ancient church of the fourth century. While the debate over the nature of the Son and his relationship to the Father was certainly ongoing, it was in some

sense reaching its zenith, and disputes over other related issues were intensifying, such as the nature of the Holy Spirit. Discussions over the theology and legacy of Origen, again, were cresting, and theologians grappled with the parameters of proper biblical exegesis, the theology of the Fall, and the reality of the future resurrection. The *Ancoratus* played a role in this transition. Finally, the theological questions and implications raised by the thinking of Apollinarius and glimpsed in the *Ancoratus* presaged the coming clashes over the Incarnation that would consume much of the fifth century.

This introduction and translation of the *Ancoratus* will demonstrate the unique contributions Epiphanius made to the theological and exegetical debates and discussions that occupied much of the fourth century. Indeed, I would argue that Epiphanius belongs in the company of Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers in modern assessments of how the early church ultimately defined and reached the conclusions of the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, and later of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Ultimately my goal has been to provide for my fellow scholars, theologians, and students a readable and faithful translation of the text, with the hopes that they might draw their own implications, interpretations, connections, and conclusions.

NOTES ON TRANSLATION

The intention of this volume was to translate as accurately and as closely as possible into readable English, though occasionally I have taken certain liberties with respect to the original word order and grammatical structure to produce a smoother translation. In general, I have used <...> to indicate where Holl inserted conjectures directly into the text of his edition, and in some cases I have incorporated into the translation emendations suggested in the critical apparatus, demarcated with <...?>. Again Kösters has provided valuable insight into the critical edition in his commentary, and he regularly evaluates Holl's conjectures and at times rejects, at times accepts them. I have indicated in the footnotes which of Kösters's suggestions I have followed.

We must remember that the *Ancoratus* was at its core a theological text, and the language and concepts of the Trinitarian disputes of the fourth century were deeply rooted in a Greek philosophical vocabulary appropriated by Christian theologians, and in some cases this translation only transliterates these terms in an attempt to show how Epiphanius tried to use them in his explanations. Thus I have rendered some of the most important terms as follows: *ousia* from οὐσία, *hypostasis* from ὑπόστασις, *homoousios* from ὁμοούσιος, and *Logos* from Λόγος.¹⁶⁵ Epiphanius also essentially invented a theological term, μονώνυμος/ν, which has been translated as “mononymic.” This was part of what Kösters described as Epiphanius’s “theology of names,” which was the bishop’s own approach to explaining and articulating the unique persons of the Trinity.¹⁶⁶ I also have transliterated the adjective ἐνυπόστατος/ν as “enhypostatic,” which is certainly related to Epiphanius’s use of *hypostasis* but made possible his maintenance of a one-*hypostasis* theology. He was also deeply concerned about affirming the real, physical, incarnate appearance and presence of Christ on earth, and he frequently used the term παρουσία to refer to it. I have simply transliterated it as *parousia* in the translation.

I have also decided, however, to translate a few other recurrent but equally important terms, though as with many complex and nuanced Greek words, a variety of translations is certainly possible. In his rejection of the understanding of God as a combination of identities or modes, Epiphanius used the term συναλοιφή, which I have translated as “coalescence,” again because a transliteration would make little sense to the reader unfamiliar with the term. Epiphanius frequently used the term οἰκονομία in the context of God’s salvific plan, and this word is rendered in the text as “economy.” Further explanations of translations or transliterations can be found in the footnotes.

165. On how Epiphanius used *homoousios* to refute Sabellianism, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 139–40.

166. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 121–71.

ANCORATUS

FOREWORD



OUR HOLY AND GREAT FATHER Epiphanius was from Eleutheropolis in Palestine, where he became a father of monks.¹ He first <practiced?> asceticism, withdrawing into Egypt, and persevering <there> until his return in his twentieth year of life, when he returned back to the country around Eleutheropolis and built a monastery there.² His treatise was called *Ancoratus*, because like an anchor, it leads the mind seeking after life and salvation, thanks to its holding fast of the arrangement in it [the treatise] of many parts of the faith, indeed I mean concerning the consubstantiality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, about the perfect *parousia* of the Incarnate Christ, about the resurrection of the dead, life everlasting, and judgment of body and soul, and at the same time against both idols and heresies and in turn Jews and others. It even contains the names of the eighty heresies and the accurate interpretation of other questions in sacred Scripture. It was written to those in Syedra of Pamphylia, who requested [it] through the letters placed herein before the text of the treatise.³ These things were done in the ninetieth year after Diocletian, the tenth year of Valentinian and Valens, the sixth of Gratian.

1. According to Holl, GCS I, 1, and Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung*, 65, this biographical foreword comes from the first editor of the first complete edition of the work of Epiphanius.

2. The “twentieth year” has caused some confusion and contention in the dating of Epiphanius’s return to his homeland, but one must bear in mind that this preface was a later editorial addition. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 29–33.

3. Syedra was located in southeastern Pamphylia. On its geographical and ecclesiastical context, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 89–90.

LETTER FROM PRESBYTERS OF SYEDRA

*Letter written to Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus in the city of Constantia, from Pamphylia in the city of Syedra, by Tarsinos and Matidios with the other presbyters, who ask about the faith, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and other aspects of the same faith.*¹



TO OUR GOD-HONORED MASTER, Bishop Epiphanius, Matidios and Tarsinos and Neon and Numerianos, presbyters of the catholic church in Syedra, send greetings in our Lord God.²

(1) The enemy of men, the Devil, has been accustomed to confuse subtly and to sow his seeds against the more simple folk, those not yet made perfect and made secure in the belief in the Holy Trinity.³ According to what has been written, "The firm foundation stands, having this seal: for the Lord knows those who are his."⁴ (2) But the totally corrupt heretics, passing over the blasphemy against Jesus, act impiously against God in a different way, "exalting" their own "language" against the Holy Spirit and "speaking injustice from on high."⁵ (3) But likewise, though multitudes are disturbed, we ourselves stand by

1. The headings of the two letters and the *Ancoratus* (henceforth *Anc.*) were the work of a later editor; cf. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 89. For the orthography of proper names, I have transliterated the Greek in the translation but have kept Latinized endings in the notes.

2. On the occasion, context, and content of Letter I, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 89–95, and above, pp. 5–7.

3. Cf. Mt 13.25.

4. 2 Tm 2.19.

5. Quotations are from Pss 11.5, 72.8. References to Psalms are based on the numbering in the text of the Septuagint. The Christians in Syedra were concerned about the teachings of the so-called Pneumatomachoi. See the introduction to this volume, pp. 20–33.

the grace of our Lord in sound faith and absolutely have not been shaken from the correct and sound teaching. And many of those who seem to have been deceived have been made wholly sound by the grace of our Lord, through the writings of the bishop Athanasios,⁶ worthy of blessed memory, and of your most pious fellow minister Proclianos. (4) But because remnants of wicked teaching still remain among some, and because it is necessary through you, the experienced farmers, to engraft them to a good olive tree or to cut them off completely,⁷ writing to your piety we ask for this favor, that your reverence consider it worthy to clarify texts for our church and to expound the correct and sound faith through a more expansive explanation, in order to strengthen and to make secure through your sacred writings the simpler who are in doubt about the faith, and to put to shame the enemy of the church, the Devil, through your holy prayers. We pray that you are in good health for a long time and that you remember us in your prayers.

6. That is, the letters to Serapion.

7. Cf. Rom 11.17-22.

LETTER FROM PALLADIOS

Letter written by Palladios, living [as a monk] in the same city of Syedra, and sent to the same Epiphanyos, bishop of Constantia on the island of Cyprus, who is himself [Palladios] also asking about the same things.¹



O THE MASTER OF my soul, the God-honored bishop Epiphanyos, Palladios living in the city of Syedra greets you in our Lord, God.

(1) Those sailing across the great and wide sea, while a calm wind guides the ship, think little of pressing on toward the banks of the harbor, thinking they easily carry the ship across. (2) But whenever an opposing and violent wind should strike, raising high the waves on all sides and engulfing the ship, then indeed do they yearn for the safe harbor; and they search around for any land nearby, but nowhere are they able to land. Finally they sail on, as thus by chance, toward an island lying nearby, in any way finding salvation for themselves. Drawing near to it and stealing away in the shelter of the outlying promontories, scarcely are they able to be delivered from an awful drowning. (3) And we are the same, O Master, being instructed in the saving word of God, being eager to free ourselves from the swell of the world, and wishing to sail our ship into the unshakable harbor of Christ, since we know some fruitless and irrational, as it seems to me, questions concerning the Holy Spirit are being asked by some people. They allege that it is not necessary for him to be glorified with divinity and sovereignty, but to be assigned the role of a servant and messenger, and they further

1. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 95–107, on issues relating to the authenticity and authorship of the headings of the letters and the identity and status of Palladius.

grasp hold of lower and baser opinions about him.² (4) Because of this, even as we are in the grip of an unstable swell and rough billow, we are able to find no one among us competent to solve the questions and able to expound to us the sound faith.³ We have urged your piety to take up the matter, and with reason we utter this cry: "Master, save us!"⁴ (5) So we need your pure and correct faith, which your good reputation anticipates and trustworthy witnesses testify and announce. Consider it worthy, being appointed for this by our Savior, to regard forbearingly our appeal and to be willing, with the sacred writings, through a wider and clearer explanation, to expound the belief in the Holy Trinity and to send these things to us, so that we, who have been made secure in this, might succeed in our efforts, and that those already walking well in it might rejoice greatly, and that those who are erring, if it is possible for them, might be cured and "glorify God in all things."⁵

2. In my translation I have used he/his/him/himself as pronouns for the Holy Spirit (though in Greek is neuter), since in many cases Epiphanius interchangeably applied to the Holy Spirit scriptural verses which in their original context referred explicitly to the Father and/or to the Son (both masculine gender nouns).

3. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 91–93, explores why the presbyters in Syedra did not seek the aid of their own local bishop or that of the metropolitan of Pamphylia, possibly because both belonged or were sympathetic to the Pneumatomachoi.

4. Cf. Mt 8.25; Lk 8.24.

5. 1 Pt 4.11.

ANCORATUS

Letter written to Pamphylia, to the presbyters Matidios and Tarsinos and Neon and Numerianos, in Syedra, and to Palladios living [as a monk] there, concerning the faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and other parts of the faith, I mean both the resurrection of the dead and the Incarnation of Christ, in the ninetieth year after Diocletian, in the month of July, about which they asked in their letters, as is contained in them and are included at the beginning.



TO MY LORDS, God-honored brothers, and fellow presbyters, Matidios and Tarsinos <and Neon> and Numerianos and all the others who are with you, and to our most longed-for sons, Palladios and Severianos, who strive after a good zeal and the blessed and much-beloved life, you who chose for yourselves both an orthodox faith and a perfect concord, fulfilling what was said by the Savior: "If you wish to be perfect, sell your possessions and give to the poor,"¹ and "They were selling their possessions and laying them at the feet of the apostles."² And as much as there are vital and the best things in us to be furnished for their consenting souls, Epiphanius, the least of the bishops, and the brothers who are with him send greetings in the Lord God.

CHAPTER ONE

(1) I might already consider myself truly blessed, beloved, because though not sufficient with respect to the way of life of the holy and excellent men who have taken up a virtuous zeal for God, I am deemed worthy by them to stimulate my mind to

1. Mt 19.21.

2. Acts 4.34-35.

stir up and to offer something useful. (2) For the always humble spirit in me, which is eager to endure quietly and not to reach further than those very much considering that which was said by the Apostle, "that we may not reach beyond the measure of the standard that the God of measure has given to us,"¹ now has come to this. (3) For the "votes from every side" hold sway, that they speak of the godly zeal in you and of those others in agreement, I mean indeed of those eager for orthodoxy, among whom is our son Hypatios coming to me from the country of the Egyptians because of the same thing.² And I have prepared to lay aside all indifference and all hesitation, no longer to withhold (and not to put off for later to write to you the things concerning the faith) from you and our brothers who ask about matters concerning our salvation from the divine and holy Scripture, the firm foundation of the faith concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and everything else about salvation in Christ, I mean of the resurrection of the dead and the *parousia* of the incarnate Only-begotten, and about the holy Old and New Testaments and the other general things pertaining to our complete salvation. (4) At any rate, I have taken the premise of these requests as no small thing, from our brother and fellow presbyter Konope and those with him, both from others and from your Honors, most beloved children, but also our son Hypatios, en route to me from Egypt because of this. I perceive the many "votes" together in unison. My heart is stung, and I considered your argument. And I am resolved eagerly to begin, without hesitation, according to the demand of your letters, because I am not only willing but also unwilling, on account of the extremity of <the> request from you and yours, for me, your humble servant, to write this letter in response to your desire.

1. Cf. 2 Cor 10.13.

2. Epiphanius may have known this Hypatios from his days as a monk in Egypt. Hypatios seems to have reported to Epiphanius the problem of Pneumatomachoi in Egypt, though it is unclear if there was any connection to the Tropikoi.

CHAPTER TWO

(1) I am very much amazed, marveling at the economy¹ of our Lord and God, who is well pleased in the abundance of his goodness to give his Holy Spirit to all, to those who seek him in truth.² For not without God's aid did I believe the requests made through the letters from you and yours <came to be>, most beloved, but I resolved that the initiative sprang up from the grace of God in you. (2) For in truth those who, understanding in an orthodox manner about the Son of God and the Holy Spirit and knowing to say what is harmonious and agreed upon, with the most blessed Apostle Peter, that "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God,"³ clearly will be blessed by the Lord himself. And how blessed was that holy man who heard, "You are blessed Simon, bar-Jonah,"⁴ that is to say, "son of Jonah." For his father was called Jonah, and the "bar" is translated from the Hebrew language as "son." (3) For this was the life that the only-begotten Son of God gave to his disciples, saying, "that they may have life in them,"⁵ and this is the life that he made known: "that they may know you, the only true God, and whom you sent, Jesus Christ."⁶ (4) So in saying "the only true God,"⁷ he has led us into unicity,⁸ that no longer "may we be subject to the elements of the world,"⁹ that polytheism may not still be among us, and that the thoughts of men may not fall apart to such fornication, but to the unity¹⁰ of the only true God: "for the first fornication was the invention of idols,"¹¹ says Scripture. (5) It also says, "and him whom you have sent, Jesus Christ."¹² Who is Jesus Christ, if not God?

1. Epiphanius's use of the term *οικονομία* was usually in the context of God's plan of salvation and/or the Incarnation, but in 84.5 and 88.1 he used it more generally to refer to God's will to do as he pleases and is able.

2. Cf. Lk 11.13.

3. Mt 16.16.

4. Mt 16.17.

5. Cf. Jn 3.15.

6. Jn 17.2-3.

7. Jn 17.3.

8. The word here is *μοναρχία*, set in opposition to "polytheism"; see Lampe, 877. This is the only use of *μοναρχία* in the *Anc.*, though Epiphanius did use it several times in the *Pan.* (8.5.5, 9.2.2, 23.3.1, 23.4.8, 46.2.6, 62.3.2-3).

9. Gal 4.3.

10. Here Epiphanius used the term *ἐνότης* (in the accusative), which Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 119, argues has a sense of a "unity of different things," that is, of different persons.

11. Wis 14.12.

12. Jn 17.3.

And if Christ Jesus is God, as John says about him, "The Only-begotten is God, the one in the bosom of the Father, who has made him known."¹³ Therefore, the Father is one God and only true God, and the Only-begotten is God. (6) Therefore, he is not alien from God and from the unity.¹⁴ But since the Son is from the Father, because of this, he is only true God. And he is not like the false gods, which some of the Greeks believe to be gods; they are not gods. But he is only true God, since the Only-begotten is only from the Only (and only the Holy Spirit). For they are Trinity in unity¹⁵ and one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.¹⁶

CHAPTER THREE

(1) And the Word terrifies those not worthy of the Holy Spirit. "For no one is able to say Jesus is Lord, if not by the Holy Spirit."¹ (2) For even the Jews say the name of Jesus, but they do not believe him to be Lord. And the Arians say the name and <they name?> him God, but they say he is adopted and not true, since they did not have a share in the Holy Spirit. (3) For if someone does not receive the Holy Spirit, he does not say Jesus is really Lord, and really God, and really Son of God, and really everlasting King. (4) For let those who have held the wicked notion understand that the Only-begotten Son of God does not wish to bear witness at all concerning himself. (5) For thus he said in the Gospel: "If I myself bear witness concerning myself, my testimony is nothing: there is another who bears witness

13. Jn 1.18.

14. Here the word is *μονάς*, which can simply be translated as "unity." Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 120, argues that it must not be understood to mean a mathematical, indivisible unit, which would then present an irreconcilable paradox, but rather in the sense of "uniqueness." In addition to the two uses in this section, Epiphanius also used the term at *Anc.* 7.3, 22.7.

15. Here, *μονάς*.

16. Epiphanius is trying to build a case here, that a belief in the *μοναρχία* of God is not incompatible with the divinity of the Son (with the Spirit here almost an afterthought, but with more to come later). Because the Son is *from* the Father, and only from the Father, then he must be God. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 118–21.

1. 1 Cor 12.3.

concerning me.”² (6) And who is the “other” but the one who spoke from heaven: “This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased”?³ And the same one who says, “If I myself bear witness concerning myself, my testimony is nothing,”⁴ again says, “even if I myself bear witness concerning myself, my testimony is true,”⁵ and again, “the very works bear witness concerning me, which the Father has given to me,”⁶ and again, “Moses wrote concerning me,”⁷ and “Moses bears witness concerning me.”⁸ (7) The first [statement] is, “If I myself bear witness concerning myself, my testimony is nothing,”⁹ in order that it might cut off the boast from those boasting and recommending themselves, since many people glorify themselves and bear witness about themselves. (8) And when he said, “Even if I myself bear witness concerning myself, my testimony is true,”¹⁰ he demonstrates that the testimony is not from man himself, but God who speaks truth <in> his testimony.¹¹ Therefore, the Father is true God; the Son is true God; the Holy Spirit is true,¹² “Spirit of God,”¹³ who is also “Spirit of truth,”¹⁴ triad accounted in one name. (9) For concerning the Father, the Son himself says, “that they may know you, the only true God.”¹⁵ The trustworthy witness is the one lying back in his [the Father’s] bosom, affirming himself the Only-begotten God.¹⁶ He did not add to the “Only-begotten God” the [phrase] “true God,” but concerning the

2. Jn 5.31–32.

3. Mt 3.17.

4. Jn 5.31.

5. Jn 8.14.

6. Jn 5.36.

7. Jn 5.46.

8. Cf. Jn 5.39.

9. Jn 5.31.

10. Jn 8.14.

11. Cf. *Pan.* 65.7.10–13 (against Paul of Samosata); Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos* 3. The pseudo-Athanasian (Apollinarius of Laodicea?) text was possibly a source for Epiphanius. See Hübner, “Die Hauptquelle,” *contra* F. Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata: Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der althristlichen Literatur 44.5 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1924), 161–64.

12. Epiphanius did not state here pointblank that “the Holy Spirit is God,” but he developed his argument for the Spirit’s divinity in greater depth below. Cf. *Pan.* 69.33.1–3; Bas., *Spir.* 9.22.

13. Rom 8.9.

14. Jn 14.17, 15.26, 16.13.

15. Jn 17.3. In *Pan.* 76.4.7 Epiphanius accused the Heteroousians of misinterpreting this verse and asserting that all God requires of believers is to know him.

16. Cf. Jn 1.18.

Father it has been written, <that> he is true God, and concerning the Son, that he is Only-begotten God. And again about the Father, that "God is light,"¹⁷ and about the Son, that "he was the true light."¹⁸

CHAPTER FOUR

(1) Observe with me the exactness of the Scriptures. For the "Father is light,"¹ and "true light" is not added about the Father. But concerning the Son it said, "true light,"² and let no one dare to say otherwise. (2) For who, driven to insanity or rather joining folly to himself, would dare to gain for himself a suspicion of blasphemy, not finding the word "truth" being added to the phrase and saying about the Father that he is not true light? (3) For if the genuine³ Son begotten from him is true light, the begetter of the Son unambiguously is true light.⁴ The very one who begot him, without beginning and non-temporally, is true light. (4) And just as one must not dare to say against the Father that he is not true light (and yet the "true" was not added), yet we know of ourselves because of our pious thinking (even if it might not have been written), that he is "true light." And we do not doubt, lest we be lost. Thus also it has been written on the Son, that the Son is God, even if "true God" is not added. We heap madness upon ourselves if we dare to blaspheme and deny that the Son is true God, even if the word might not have

17. 1 Jn 1.5.

18. Jn 1.9.

1. 1 Jn 1.5.

2. Jn 1.9.

3. The word here is *γνήσιος*, indicating genuine, legitimate sonship; cf. Lampe, 317. This term was particularly important for Athanasius to qualify the filiation of the Son; cf. Morales, *La théologie*, 315-17.

4. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.4, 3.13-15; *de decretis Nicaenae synodi* 23.1-24.5; *de sententia Dionysii* 24; *syn.* 52.1-5, which appealed to a parallel argument about light and radiance (as opposed to fire from the sun). To preach that the Son is radiance necessarily implies that he is "from the *ousia*" of the Father, that is, *homoousios*. Contrast with Eus., *d.e.* 4.3 (147a-149b). For a survey of Christian use of different forms of light imagery with a particular focus on Athanasius, who depended on Dionysius of Alexandria, see Morales, *La théologie*, 494-97, 515-42.

been added. (5) For it is enough to apply to one, the whole bond of the Trinity, and to think that from the Father the Son is true God and the Spirit true, with equal weight of the truth corresponding to each name, on the one hand to the Father, “true God,” on the other hand to the Son, “God.” (6) And again to the Son, “true light,”⁵ and to the Father, “light,”⁶ in order that, as we bind together the two beliefs concerning the divinity, we might confess about the Father, “true God,” and about the Son, “true light,”⁷ about the Father, “light,”⁸ and about the Son, “God.” From “light” and “God,” let us confess the one divinity, and from “true God” and “true light,” the one unity of power.⁹

CHAPTER FIVE

(1) Likewise also on the Holy Spirit: “and if I depart, he comes,”¹ it says, “the Spirit of truth.”² And yet about himself he says, “I am the truth,”³ and about the Father, “the Spirit of my Father who speaks in you,”⁴ and about the Spirit, “my Spirit has stood in your midst.”⁵ (2) The Spirit mysteriously acts with the Son: “he casts him out into the desert,”⁶ “to be tempted by the Devil.”⁷ (3) And the Lord himself [says]: “the Spirit of the Lord, because he anointed me.”⁸ And the Holy Spirit says in the prophets: “the Lord Almighty says these things,”⁹ <and> “the Lord speaking in the prophets,”¹⁰ “the one strengthening thunder and creating wind,”¹¹ thunder heard by men, and creating wind for the activity¹² of the rain sent from God to the

5. Jn 1.9.

6. 1 Jn 1.5.

7. Jn 1.9.

8. 1 Jn 1.5.

9. Epiphanius reiterated against the Arians this argument about “true” and “light” in *Pan.* 69.32.1–6. Cf. Bas., *Eun.* 2.25–29, with a focus on Eunomius’s belief that the “light” of the Father and that of the Son differ, as the former is unbegotten, the latter not.

1. Jn 16.7.

2. Jn 14.17, 15.26, 16.13.

3. Jn 14.6.

4. Mt 10.20.

5. Hg 2.5.

6. Mk 1.12.

7. Mt 4.1.

8. Lk 4.18.

9. This phrase is repeated many times in the minor prophets, and I have not made reference to any particular biblical passage.

10. Cf. Heb 1.1.

11. Am 4.13.

12. ἐνέργεια.

earth.¹³ (4) And about created things thus it says: "strengthening thunder and creating wind":¹⁴ for these things exist as created things. But "announcing his Christ to men,"¹⁵ no longer [does it say] creating, nor strengthening, (5) but "announcing him to men,"¹⁶ the one truly begotten from the one who is true, the uncreated one, the immutable one, the invariable one, he who always exists from him who always exists, the one declared through <Moses and> John as he who always exists. "I AM, for he says, has sent me,"¹⁷ says Moses, and John: "the one who is in the bosom of the Father, that one expounded him [the Father]."¹⁸ (6) The Father is the one who is;¹⁹ the Son is the one who is. He is "the one who is with the one who is,"²⁰ begotten from him, who is not a coalescence²¹ with the Father, who did not begin

13. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 130–31, discusses the significance of Epiphanius's citation of Am 4.13, which was a significant biblical verse for those who denied the divinity of the Spirit. The Pneumatomachoi interpreted the "wind" (the same word as "spirit") as referring to the Holy Spirit and thus affirming that the Spirit was created. Kösters is struck, however, at how casual and brief Epiphanius's use and explanation of the verse were, especially in comparison to Athanasius's interpretations of the same verse in *Ath., ep. Serap.* 1.8.4–10.3. In the first interpretation he offered, Athanasius understood the "wind" or "spirit" in this verse as more generic and not specifically about the Holy Spirit. Just a little later (1.9), however, he reinterpreted the "spirit" as a reference to spirit in humans in order to accommodate his interpretation of the second half of the verse as a prophecy of the Incarnation; cf. DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind," 649. Also see Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 61–68. Both Athanasius and Basil connected this verse to prophecies, though they each pointed to different New Testament passages to demonstrate how the prophecies were fulfilled.

See also Basil, *Eun.* 3.7; Did., *spir.* 65–74. DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind," has argued that rather than understanding Basil (and Didymus) as influenced by Athanasius and his letters to Serapion, we must understand Basil to have been influenced by Didymus. Bas., *Eun.* 3.7, interpreted the "thunder" of Am 4.13 as a prophecy of the Incarnation: "Perhaps this text is even a prophecy that refers to the incarnation of the Lord. The voice that came from heaven, thought to be thunder by those who heard it, was sent by God the Father to proclaim Christ to humanity through it" (trans. DelCogliano and Radde-Gallwitz, *Against Eunomius*, FOTC 122, 195).

14. Am 4.13.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Ex 3.14.

18. Jn 1.18.

19. ὧν ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ.

20. Cf. Jn 1.2.

21. Epiphanius used the term συναλοιφή or "coalescence" or "identity" spe-

to exist, but <who is> always genuine Son with the Father, the Father always begetting the Son.²² (7) For there was not ever a season²³ when the Father was not Father; there was not ever a season when <the?> Son did not-exist with the only Father.²⁴ For if there was a season when he [the Father] was not Father, then he himself was also the son of another father, before he was the Father of the Only-begotten.²⁵ (8) And those who seem to be pious toward the Father are absolutely impious. For in God, no measurable time,²⁶ no season, no point of measurable time, no fraction of an hour, no movement of the eye, no uncertainty of thought is possible.²⁷ (9) But however much your thinking rises to comprehend and to believe in the Son, at the same time it thinks also about the Father. For the name is significant.²⁸ For

cifically against Modalist doctrine, particularly as espoused by Paul of Samosata (cf. *Pan.* 65.8.1) and allegedly Marcellus of Ancyra (cf. *Pan.* 72). For definitions and explanation, see the entry in Lampe, 1258; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 132–33. The term can also be translated as “identity,” but I have favored “coalescence” to convey the sense of combination of modal identities, which Epiphanius vehemently rejected. For subsequent uses of the term, see *Anc.* 6.3, 6.10, 7.3, 10.6, 47.5, 48.5, 81.2, 81.9; *Pan.* 65.8.1. Cf. Eus., *e.th.* 3.15.3 (a defense of a subordinating view of the Son); Cyr. H., *catech.* 4.8 (anti-Sabellian use of the term).

22. Epiphanius emphasized here the pro-Nicene position that the Son did not ever begin to exist, but at the same time was not unbegotten, a characteristic only true of the Father. See the interesting parallel in Or., *princ.* 1.2, on the necessary eternality of the Son.

23. In this and the following statements, Epiphanius used *καίρως*.

24. This statement was a direct challenge to the assertion made by Arius (at least as Athanasius presented it) that there was when God was not a Father and existed alone. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1.5.

25. Epiphanius followed a line of argument that viewed “Father” and “Son” as correlative terms, such that the very name “Father” necessary implied the existence of the “Son” and that the Son’s existence was an essential aspect of the being of the Father. See Morales, *La théologie*, 201–31.

26. Here the word is *χρόνος*, which I have translated “measurable time” to distinguish it from *καίρως* time.

27. Epiphanius was addressing here the question of whether or not the Father was prior to the Son. These statements echo the beliefs asserted by Alexander of Alexandria to Arius, who complained about them in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, cited in *Pan.* 69.6.1–7.

28. For a critical discussion on the importance of name theories in the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century, see DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*.

whenever you call on the Son, saying "Son," you think about the Father: for from the Son, the Father is thought about. And whenever you call on the Father, you indicate the Son: for the Father is called such in all ways from the Son.²⁹

CHAPTER SIX

(1) For when are you able to dare and to say that the Father was not the Father, that you might also dare to say that the Son was not <the Son>?¹ And if you do not dare to add worth to the Father (for the divinity exists immutably and is not in need of addition, nor glory, nor progress), "learn not to blaspheme."² O enemy of the faith! Rather, you who drive yourself away from the faith! (2) But you must believe always that the eternal Father truly begot the Son, the one who always really is with the Father who really is. But believe that he is the one who has been begotten. (3) For the Son is not ever a coalescence with the Father, nor a sibling, but genuine Son who has been begotten from the Father. He is natural Son, not adopted. He is Son *homoousios* with the Father,³ not sharing in essence,⁴ but *homoousios*, that is to say, not begotten apart from the Father, as some hold in dissimulation, wishing the Son to be so from adoption and not in truth.⁵ (4) To say *homoousios* is the bond of the

29. Cf. Cyr. H., *catech.* 7.4; Ath., *Ar.* 3.6; *de sententia Dionysii* 17, 22. See DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 243–48, on Christian use of terminological-cognitive and terminological-relational entailment.

1. Epiphanius seemed to follow the Christian interpretive tradition of viewing Father and Son as Aristotelian relatives, in which the "Father's existence entails the Son's existence, and if the Father is eternal, so too is the Son eternal" (DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 228). The belief in the co-eternality of the Son supported by name relativity would have put Epiphanius in continuity with the thinking of Origen and other Alexandrians, though certainly with modifications. See DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 228–34.

2. 1 Tm 1.20.

3. This phrase was directly related to Nicaea. See Stead, *Divine Substance*, 242–66.

4. Translation: "sharing in essence" = *συνούσιος*. Epiphanius wanted to emphasize that the Son does not share in the essence of the Father through participation in an intermediary way, but that Father and Son are of the same essence, *homoousios*.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 69.6.7 on Arius's assertions about the Son; 69.54.2, 69.71.7, on

faith.⁶ For if you say *homoousios*, you destroy the power of Sabellius.⁷ (5) For whenever [you say] *homoousios*, it is indicative of one *hypostasis*,⁸ but it indicates that the Father is enhypostatic, the Son is enhypostatic, and the Holy Spirit is enhypostatic.⁹

the rejection of the notion of Son as sibling; 73.36.3, on a similar summary of the relationship between Father and Son.

6. Of course the use and interpretation of *homoousios* proved to be quite complex in the fourth century, and scholars have recognized that Athanasius himself did not actively promote the term as a standard of orthodoxy until some two decades after the Council of Nicaea and its Creed. When he did, however, he did so quite forcefully, as he had to sanitize its previous connection with the theology of Paul of Samosata and justify its non-Scriptural terminology. Cf. Ath., *decr.* 19.1–32.5; *syn.* 41.1–46.3. See Ayres, *Nicaea*, 85–103; idem, “Athanasius’ Initial Defense of the Term Ὁμοούσιος: Rereading the *De decretis*,” *J ECS* 12.3 (2004): 337–59.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 76.7.8–9, in opposition to Heteroousian theology. Epiphanius refuted Sabellianism in *Pan.* 62.

8. Here Epiphanius seems to confess a one-*hypostasis*, that is, a miahypostatic, theology (as also below, *Anc.* 67). See his potential shift in usage and meaning of *hypostasis*, or at least a greater ambiguity, in *Anc.* 81.4–9.

9. Cf. *Pan.* 62.3.5. The term Epiphanius used here was ἐνυπόστατος/ν, which can be translated “subsistent,” but I have rendered it “enhypostatic.” The implication is that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each have a real, independent, essential existence, in particular in opposition to the modalist theology associated with Sabellius (and in fourth-century polemic, Marcellus of Ancyra); cf. Cyr. H., *catech.* 11.10, 17.5. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 337, n. 24. Epiphanius used the term eighteen times in the *Anc.* and always in the context of the real, essential existence of the Persons of the Trinity, but at the same time this represented his attempt to preserve a one-*hypostasis* theology of the Godhead.

Compare Epiphanius’s approach with the one taken by Jer., *Ep.* 15.3: “We ask what they [Arians] think ‘three *hypostaseis*’ is supposed to mean. They reply, ‘three subsistent persons.’ So we reply that that is what we believe. But the sense is not enough [for them]; they demand the term itself. I am uncertain what venom lies in the words. We declare, ‘If a person does not confess three *hypostaseis* as three ἐνυπόστατα, that is, as three subsistent persons, let him be anathema.’ But because I do not learn the specific designations, I am judged a heretic. Moreover, [I say] if a person, understanding *hypostasis* as *ousia*, does not say that in the three Persons there is one *hypostasis*, he is an alien from Christ. And under this confession, you [Pope Damasus] and I are equally branded with the mark of ‘oneness’ [i.e., Sabellianism]” (translation mine). On the importance of this letter as an insight into western Trinitarian thought, see Gemeinhardt, “Apollinaris of Laodicea.”

The term had much greater significance in later Christological debates. See U. Lang, “Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos: Church Fathers, Protestant Orthodoxy, and Karl Barth,” *JTS* 49.2 (1998): 630–57; R. Cross, “Individual Natures in the

(6) And whenever someone says *homoousios*, he does not indicate that he is alien from the same divinity, but that the Son is God from God, and the Holy Spirit is God, of the same divinity, not three gods.¹⁰ (7) Nor if when we say that the Son and the Father are God, do we say two gods, for our God is one, as the blessed Moses says: "The Lord your God, the Lord is one."¹¹ (8) We do not say gods; [we say] God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit, and not gods. For there is no polytheism in God. But through the three names, the one divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit <is indicated>. (9) And there are not two sons: for the one Son is Only-begotten, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit that is holy, the "Spirit of God,"¹² always existing with the Father and Son, not alien from God, but being from God, "proceeding from the Father"¹³ and "receiving from the Son."¹⁴ (10) But the Only-begotten Son is incomprehensible, and the Spirit is incomprehensible, and from God, not alien from the Father and Son. He is not a coalescence of the Father and Son. But the Trinity, is always of the same *ousia*, neither another *ousia* besides the divinity, nor another divinity besides the *ousia*, but the same divinity and from the same divinity, the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹⁵

Christology of Leontius of Byzantium," *J ECS* 10.2 (2002): 245–65; B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐννότητος from Origen to John of Damascus*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), especially 11–41 for pre-Chalcedonian Trinitarian development and use of the term.

10. Here is an important, explicit statement on the Holy Spirit as God, *contra* Bas., *Spir*. See also Apoll., *Kata Meros Pistis* 19 (henceforth *KMP*, as per Spoerl, *A Study*) for the argument against three gods, though with the language of *prosopa* to distinguish the persons.

11. Dt 6.4.

12. Rom 8.9.

13. Jn 15.26.

14. Jn 16.14. For subsequent usage of these verses in connection to the Holy Spirit, see *Anc.* 7.1, 8.4, 11.3, 67.1, 72.9, 73.1, 119.1; *Pan.* 69.34.3(4) (Holl forgot to include in his edition a "section 4" and instead skipped right to "5"); Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 342, n. 41. As to the question of the procession of the Spirit, see below, 75 n. 4.

15. Cf. *Pan.* 65.8.1–4.

CHAPTER SEVEN

(1) And the Spirit is the Holy Spirit, and the Son is the Son. And the Spirit, is the one “proceeding from the Father”¹ and “receiving from the Son,”² “searching the depths of God,”³ announcing the things of the Son in the world, sanctifying the saints through the Trinity,⁴ third in naming⁵ (since the Trinity is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: for it says, “going forth, baptize in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit”),⁶ seal of grace, bond of the Trinity, not alien from the number, not separate from the naming, not a stranger from the gift. But there is one God, one faith, one Lord, one grace, one church, one baptism.⁷ (2) For the Trinity is always Trinity and never receives an addition, thus being counted: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁸ (3) The Trinity is not a coalescence, not something different in itself, from its very own unity, but exists in a *hypostasis* of perfection. Perfect is the

1. Jn 15.26.

2. Jn 16.14.

3. 1 Cor 2.10.

4. Bas., *Eun.* 3.3, emphasized the Spirit as sanctifier, not sanctified, which speaks to his divinity: “Just as the Father is holy by nature and the Son is holy by nature, so too is the Spirit of truth holy by nature” (trans. DelCogliano and Radde-Gallwitz, *Against Eunomius*, FOTC 122, 188). Also cf. Did., *spir.* 10–15, which argued that that which sanctifies cannot be of the same substance as that which is sanctified. Apoll., *KMP* 8 expressed a parallel idea: “Then again, if someone says that even the Holy Spirit is a creature who has been sanctified, he will no longer be able to think that all things are sanctified in the Spirit. For He who has sanctified one thing sanctifies all things as well” (trans. and numbering from Spoerl, *A Study*, 381).

5. “naming” = *ὀνομασία*, to distinguish from forms of *ὄνομα*.

6. Mt 28.19.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 62.4.1–2 for a similar list of titles and attributes, with added nuance. Ath. *Ar.* 1.47, *ep. Serap.* 1.22.3–23.7, 2.12.1–3, also emphasized the Spirit’s sanctifying and sealing work. On the importance of the naming of all of the persons of the Godhead and believing in them rightly in the context of baptism, see Ath., *Ar.* 2.41–43, *ep. Serap.* 1.28.1–30.3, 2.15.4–6; Bas., *Eun.* 2.2, 3.5, *Spir.* 12; Apoll., *KMP* 9, 24. The implication was that a singular act of worship of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the act of baptism necessitated that they share a single divine substance.

8. Cf. *Pan.* 62.3.6, 74.12.1, for similar expressions. Also cf. Ps.-Ath., *Sabell.* 7. On the significance of this formula as well as Epiphanius’s source for it, see Hübner, “Epiphanius,” 325–33.

Father; perfect is the Son; perfect is the Holy Spirit: Father and Son and Holy Spirit.⁹ (4) Again the Spirit is assigned in gifts: "for there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are varieties of ministries, but the same Lord. And there are varieties of activities, but the same God,¹ the one working all things in all."¹⁰ (5) Let us not fall away from that which lies before us. Let us not apostatize from the truth. We do not advocate on behalf of God, but we think piously, so that we may not perish. And we speak not as those who [fully] comprehend: for as men we speak [only] what we have comprehended.¹¹ (6) For the honor in regard to God is infinite and has been magnified ten-thousand-fold compared to our thinking, and <the Trinity> has been magnified, adding nothing of glory and in no way being deprived of its uniqueness. (7) For nothing in the Trinity is created or added. But the Father begets the Son, nor was there ever a time¹² when the Son was not. For the Father was not at any time not called Father, but the Father always was, and the Son always was, not a sibling, but Son begotten indescribably and being named incomprehensibly. And he is with the Father always and never ceasing to exist. (8) So the Father is unbegotten,¹³ and uncre-

9. Again Epiphanius seems to underscore here a singular *hypostasis* that necessarily exists as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

10. 1 Cor 12.4-6. In *Pan.* 74.14.6, Epiphanius emphasized that the Pneumatomachoi were strangers to this gift because of their heretical beliefs. Cf. also *Ath., ep. Serap.* 1.27.1-2, which argued that the Spirit is one, but the creatures who partake of him are many: "But the Spirit is always the same. For he is not one of those who participate, but all things participate in him" (DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 95). And with respect to gifts, see *Ath., ep. Serap.* 1.30.4-31.11. For example, Athanasius wrote: "For this grace and gift given in the Trinity is given by the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. Just as the grace given through the Son is from the Father, so too we cannot have fellowship with the gift except in the Holy Spirit. For it is when we participate in the Spirit that we have the love of the Father and the grace of the Son and the fellowship of the Spirit himself (1.30.6-7; DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 100). See also Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 77-86.

11. This may be a criticism of the Heteroousians, who believed that humans could know God's very essence.

12. Here the word is χρόνος.

13. ἀγέννητος. Epiphanius used this term just once in the *Anc.* See Kopecek, *A History*, 242-66, but more recently DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 98-124, for useful discussions of Christian appropriation and use of this term and its rela-

ated, and incomprehensible. The Son is begotten, but both uncreated and incomprehensible.¹⁴ The Holy Spirit always was, not begotten,¹⁵ not created,¹⁶ not a sibling, not an uncle, not an ancestor, not an offspring, but the Holy Spirit from the same *ousia* of the Father and Son.¹⁷ “For God is spirit.”¹⁸

tionship to ἀγένητος. Also see Hanson, *The Search*, 202–6, for a succinct summary of the problems related to the terms. Ath., *Ar.* 1.30–34, rejected the term as applied to the relationship between Father and Son; it was only applicable to God as related to that which was created. Cf. Ath., *decr.* 28.1–32.5. For an analysis of Athanasius’s views, see Morales, *La théologie*, 211–17.

14. *Pan.* 76.6.1–11 discussed the Heteroousian (or polemically Anomoian, according to Epiphanius) assertion that the difference between “begotten” and “unbegotten” was a difference in names, which for Aetius and Eunomius implied essential difference. Furthermore, they asserted that the term “unbegotten” was revelatory of the essence of the Father, and thus “begotten” was that of the Son (see, for example, *Eun.*, *apol.* 7). Then *Pan.* 76.11.1–12.37 reproduced a treatise by Aetius (*Syntagmaton*), in which he built on this idea of essential difference by explaining that if God is unbegotten in essence, then what is begotten is not produced from a separation of essence, because something cannot be both unbegotten and begotten (cf. *Eun.*, *apol.* 9). Thus the “offspring” of God cannot be unbegotten, and so he and Eunomius argued that the Son was begotten by the will of the Father (as had other non-Nicenes; see for example Ath., *Ar.* 3.59–67). Epiphanius systematically attempted to refute each point of the treatise in the entry. See DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, for a thorough discussion of the Heteroousian theory and understanding of names as applied to God.

15. Cf. *Pan.* 69.18.6, 74.12.7–8, 76.3.3, 76.39.13–14, where Epiphanius repeated the belief that the Spirit is “not begotten,” in connection with the Father as “unbegotten” and the Son as “begotten.” Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 148–51, emphasizes Epiphanius’s difficulty in offering a clear, defined understanding of the Spirit with respect to his relationship to the Father and Son. Athanasius also responded to this question in *ep. Serap.* 1.15.1–21.4; cf. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 65–70. Also cf. Bas., *ep.* 125.3.

16. Rather than using the alpha privative form ἀκτιστος, Epiphanius here used οὐ κτιστόν for the Holy Spirit, just as he had with the previous designation of “not begotten.”

17. The last idea, that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Father and Son, is a prevalent theme in Didymus’s defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

18. Jn 4.24.

CHAPTER EIGHT

(1) Each of the names is mononymic, not having a duplication.¹ For the Father is Father and has no parallel, nor is he joined together with another father, so that there may not be two gods.² (2) And <the?> Son is only-begotten, true God from true God, not having the name of Father, nor being alien from the Father, but existing as Son of the Father. He is only-begotten, that the "Son" may be mononymic;³ and he is God from God, in order that Father and Son may be called one God. (3) And the Holy Spirit is one-of-a-kind,⁴ not having the name of "Son," nor hav-

1. "mononymic" = μονώνυμον, can be translated something like "singular, unique name," which Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 152-53, argues is essentially an invented term (see Lampe, 884, with the only attestation of term in Epiphanius). Kösters connects this to his theory of Epiphanius's "theology of the name," which was a means for the bishop to explain the individual ontological and relational existence of the persons of the Trinity. Epiphanius believed that the names "Father," "Son," and "Holy Spirit" belonged exclusively to the respective Persons in the Godhead, and no human analogy of the same words (i.e. father and son) was possible or comparable. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 157, posits that Epiphanius would eventually replace this term with a developed theology of the term *hypostasis*; cf. *Pan.* 62.3.6: "But the Trinity was always Trinity, and the Trinity never receives an addition, being one divinity, one sovereignty, one glory, but enumerated as Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And not as one thing called with three names, but the names are perfect, the *hypostaseis* perfect" (trans. mine). Here Epiphanius reiterated the ontological uniqueness of each name of the persons of the Godhead, but with a switch away from the language of *mononym* to that of *hypostasis*.

Epiphanius's use of the concept "mononymic" exhibited interesting parallels Basil's understanding of proper names, which do not disclose actual substance, but distinguishing marks of the named. See Bas., *Eun.* 2.5, 28-29; DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 190-96.

Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.16.1-7 articulated specific ideas about the distinction of each person of the Trinity in terms of relations (also without recourse to the term *hypostasis*; see Morales, *La théologie*, 217-31). DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 127-33, also demonstrates Athanasius's view that all God's names refer to the divine substance, though they do not reveal what God's substance is.

2. On the argument against two gods, cf. Ps.-Ath., *Sabell.* 5.

3. Contrast with Eus., *d.e.* 5.1 (211d-217b).

4. According to Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 151-52, n. 181, the use here of μονογενές presents a problem, since Epiphanius seemed to avoid this term for the Spirit in *Anc.* 7.8. The term here is the neuter of μονογενής, which when applied to the Son means "only-begotten." Therefore, if the same adjective was applied

ing the naming of “Father,” but thus called Holy Spirit, not alien from the Father. (4) For the Only-begotten himself says: “The Spirit of the Father,”⁵ and “the one proceeding from the Father,”⁶ and “he will receive from what is mine,”⁷ in order that he may not be believed alien from the Father and the Son, but of the same *ousia*, the same divinity, divine Spirit, the “Spirit of truth,”⁸ the “Spirit of God,”⁹ the Spirit “Paraclete,”¹⁰ called mononymically,¹¹ not having a parallel, not being equated with some other spirit, not called by the name of the Son or being named with the naming of the Father, in order that the mononymic names may not be homonymic, (5) except “God” in the Father, “God” in the Son, in the Holy Spirit, “of God”¹² and “God.”¹³ (6) For the “Spirit of God,”¹⁴ both Spirit of the Father and Spirit of the Son, is not according to some synthesis, as soul and body are in us, but is in the midst of Father and Son, from the Father and the Son, third in naming.¹⁵ (7) For it says, “Going forth, baptize in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”¹⁶ And if the Father

to the Spirit, questions remain as to its theological meaning. B. Schultze, “Das Filioque bei Epiphanius von Cypern (im Ancoratus),” *Ostkirchliche Studien* 35.1 (1986): 111–12, suggests that Epiphanius, building on Septuagint usage, meant this use here to mean something akin to “sole” or “unique,” or, as I have translated it here, “one-of-a-kind.” There may also be a textual problem, as indicated in Holl’s *apparatus*.

5. Mt 10.20.

6. Jn 15.26.

7. Jn 16.14.

8. Jn 14.17, 15.26, 16.13.

9. Rom 8.9.

10. Jn 14.16, 14.26, 15.26, 16.7.

11. It is difficult to translate *μονωνύμως* as an adverb in idiomatic English.

12. Rom 8.9.

13. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.4.1–4, for a discussion of how, in Scripture, references to the Holy Spirit were always qualified to designate him from all other spirits. The translation of “homonymic” = *ὁμώνυμα*; for discussion on the philosophical background for this term, see Kösters *Die Trinitätslehre*, 154–56. Also see Bas., *Eun.* 2.1–5, 9–10, in which he argued against Eunomius’s idea that different names necessarily meant different substances; thus “Father” and “Son,” because they were different names, would mean they are of different *ousiai*. See DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 38–42, for the implications in Eunomius’s thinking of homonymic and synonymic names as applied to simple beings.

14. Rom 8.9.

15. Here, the word “naming” = *ὀνομασία*, which can also be translated “designation,” though not implying a gradation; see entry in Lampe, 965.

16. Mt 28.19.

baptizes in his own name, in the name of God, and the perfect seal in the name of God has been sealed in us, and Christ baptizes in his own name, in the name of God, and the perfect seal in the name of God has been sealed in us, who would dare to wage war against his own soul, saying that the Spirit is alien from the divinity? (8) For if <we seal> in the name of the Father and in the name of the Son and in the name of the Holy Spirit, there is one seal of the Trinity. Therefore, there is one power of the divinity in the Trinity. And if God is the One, but the others are created and not God, by what reason are the two connected to the one in the seal of perfection? (9) Then at any rate, we were sealed in a royal name, the one of the Father (and the others are not royal), but we further have been enslaved to elements and created things. And, the name alone of the Father was not able to save, but the one who created added to himself two other elements, according to the thinking of those who blaspheme, in order that his divinity might add other powers and might be able to save the one sealed by him, and that the man created by him might gain redemption through the forgiveness of sins.¹⁷

CHAPTER NINE

(1) Alas, such foolishness! O such blasphemy! From where did another novel unbelief stealthily enter back into life, or rather should I say wicked belief? For wicked belief is worse than unbelief. For unbelief, might receive belief, and be corrected, but wicked belief is irremediable, being saved with great difficulty, unless perhaps some anointing should come from above.¹ (2) So blessed Peter says to them with Ananias: "Why

17. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 2.41, on the necessity of naming the Son in baptism, though without the equal emphasis on the Spirit, although one can also contrast Ath., *decr.* 31.1-4. Did., *spir.* 101-3, however, emphasized the absolute necessity of naming all three. Bas., *Spir.* 10.24, 10.26, 12.28, 15.35, argued that the fact that one of the divine Persons was not named in certain scriptural passages relating to baptism did not imply that said Person was not a necessary part of baptism; cf. Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 129-37. In fact, for Basil baptism cannot be efficacious if it is not Triune; see Hildebrand, *The Trinitarian Theology*, 173-87.

1. Epiphanius seemed to imply that even wicked belief, i.e., heresy, as terrible as it was, could still be corrected through divine aid. For an actual example

is it that Satan tempted you to lie to the Holy Spirit?"² and he says, "You did not lie to men, but to God."³ (3) Then the Spirit is God from the Father and Son, [the Spirit] to whom those misappropriating funds lied.⁴ So Paul also agrees with this statement, saying, "You are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you."⁵ So then the Spirit is God, as stated before.⁶ (4) Because of the temple of God, they also will be called holy men, those who established in themselves the Holy Spirit of God, as the chief of the Apostles [Peter] bears witness, the one who was deemed worthy to be blessed by the Lord, because the Father revealed to him.⁷ (5) Therefore, the Father reveals the true Son to him [Peter], and he is blessed; and again the same one [the Father] reveals his Holy Spirit. (6) It was necessary for the first of the Apostles, the solid rock, "upon whom the church of God would be built, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it,"⁸ <to declare this?>. The gates of Hades are the heresies and the heresiarchs.⁹ (7) For in every way the faith was

of how Epiphanius differentiated these three different categories, see, for example, *Anc.* 83.1, 90.6.

2. Acts 5.3.

3. Acts 5.4.

4. That this is a description of the ontological relationship of the Spirit to the Father and Son and not about the Spirit's procession from both, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 164–65, especially n. 240, in opposition to Schultze, "Das Filioque," among others. For a survey of the scholarship on Epiphanius as an early representative of the *filioque*, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 342–44, especially n. 41. Ultimately Kösters argues that to attribute to Epiphanius a theology of the double procession of the Spirit is anachronistic. Epiphanius's overarching concern in the *Anc.* is the relationship of the Holy Spirit with respect to the Father (and the Trinity). Shapland, *The Letters*, 40–41, 64 n. 13, sees in Athanasius a lack of clarity in his understanding of the Spirit's procession and mission (especially in the interpretation of Jn 15.26) as they relate to the Son and thus ambiguity on the question of double procession. Campbell, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," 434–38, draws largely the same conclusion as Shapland. See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 147–55; Simonetti, *La crisi*, 494–501; Morales, *La théologie*, 104–53.

5. 1 Cor 3.16. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 2.12.4–5, for how Athanasius interpreted this verse to affirm the divinity of the Spirit.

6. Cf. Did., *spir.* 83, for a parallel interpretation of the Acts passage.

7. Cf. Mt 16.16–17.

8. Mt 16.18.

9. Cf. *Pan.* 74.14.4, on heresies as "gates of Hell."

made firm in him, in the one who received the key of heaven, in the one who looses upon the earth and binds in heaven.¹⁰ (8) For in this man are found all the subtleties¹¹ being asked of the faith. (9) This man is the one who denied three times and cursed three times before the rooster crowed.¹² For indicating the abundance of his love toward his master, affirming confidently he was saying: "even if all deny you, I will not deny,"¹³ saying so much in reference to his [Christ's] humanity. (10) This is the one who wept at the sound of the rooster,¹⁴ in order that he might truly confess that the arrest of the Son of God was not in appearance, but true, in order that he [Peter] might say that he was a true man in weeping at his arrest, having been handed over by the Pharisees. (11) This is <the> one who came to Galilee to fish, the one who was a partner of the one reclining upon his breast (for he [John], learning from the Son and receiving from the Son, was revealing the power of knowledge, (12) and he was aided by the Father, laying the foundation of the certainty of the faith). He [Peter] is the one who, unclothed in the boat on <Lake> Tiberias,¹⁵ back after being called, was fishing (and the disciple, whom Jesus loved, <was with him?>). After the statement that the Savior made: "Children, you do not have anything to eat, do you?"¹⁶ and, "Cast on the right side of the ship and you will find [fish],"¹⁷ and after the astonishing statement happened, John, whom Jesus loved, said to Peter: "It is the Lord,"¹⁸ man according to the flesh, born from Mary in truth not in appearance, being God <according to> Spirit, coming from the Father from the heavens. (13) <This man> is the one who heard from him [Christ], "Peter, tend my sheep,"¹⁹ the one who has been entrusted with the flock, the one guiding well in the power of his own master, the one confessing concerning the flesh, the one truthfully announcing the things of the Father

10. Cf. Mt 16.19.

11. According to Lampe, the term λεπτολόγημα is attested only in Epiphanius, here and in *Pan.* 72.10.4.

12. Cf. Mt 26.34, 69-74; Mk 14.30, 66-71; Lk 22.54-61.

13. Mt 26.33; Mk 14.29.

14. Cf. Mt 26.75; Mk 14.72; Lk 22.62.

15. Cf. Jn 21.7.

16. Jn 21.5.

17. Jn 21.6.

18. Jn 21.7.

19. Jn 21.15.

concerning the Son, the one indicating the Spirit and his worthiness in divinity, the one giving the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas with James and John, in order that “through three witnesses all that is said may stand.”²⁰

CHAPTER TEN

(1) For nothing is able to be without two or three testimonies.¹ For in them, <even the faith>² of those in the Law, of those who acknowledged only the Father, was established through a mystery, except that they might receive power of the Son, and might be empowered through the testimonies of the Father and Son, and through the third testimony might receive the Holy Spirit and might be filled, (2) with the expressions of the Cherubim and Seraphim manifestly proclaiming aloud thrice, “Holy, Holy, Holy.”³ (3) For not through two expressions is the praise in heaven perfected, nor do the same holy and invisible spiritual living beings proclaim a fourth thing, nor do they render a fourth expression, nor only one, but three single expressions: “Holy, Holy, Holy.”⁴ (4) And they do not say, “Holies, Holies,” in order that they might not proclaim a single, multi-named⁵ thing nor conceal the number of the three. But three times they give the proclamation of holiness, uniformly and singularly they chant the phrase, in order that they may not name a polytheism.⁶ (5) For God is one, Father in Son, Son in Father with Holy Spirit.⁷ And because of this, “the holy one resting among

20. Cf. Dt 19.15; Mt 18.20.

1. Cf. Dt 19.15; Mt 18.20.

2. I follow Holl's conjecture of <καὶ ἡ πίστις>, as does Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 166 n. 247.

3. Is 6.2–3. See Morales, *La théologie*, 79–88, for the different exegetical interpretations of this passage, and 85–86 for the role of Epiphanius's exegesis of this passage of Isaiah in support of a Trinitarian theology.

4. Is 6.3.

5. “multi-named” = πολωνυμον; cf. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 166–67, especially n. 250.

6. Cf. *Anc.* 26.1–3, for a parallel, but different interpretation of Isaiah 6.3.

7. Cf. Bas., *Spir.* 25.58–29.75, on the vigorous defense of the expression “with the Holy Spirit” as essentially interchangeable with “in the Holy Spirit,” both attesting to the full divinity of the Spirit.

the holy ones,"⁸ the true Father is enhypostatic and the true Son is enhypostatic and the true Holy Spirit is enhypostatic, being three, one divinity, one *ousia*, one praise, one God.⁹ (6) You named the Son; you embraced the Trinity in your thinking. You possessed the Holy Spirit; you have been deemed worthy of the Fatherly power and of the Son of God. You praised the Father; you indicated the Son and the Holy Spirit. But not according to a coalescence: (7) for the Father is Father; the Son is Son; the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit. But the Trinity has not been alienated from unity and identity. The Father is honored insofar as he is Father; the Son is honored in so far as he is Son; the Holy Spirit is honored in so far as he is true Spirit and "Spirit of God."¹⁰ (8) Thus the Only-begotten says, "the one honoring the Father honors the Son."¹¹ For in saying "Father," you indicate the Son, and you honor the Son.¹² And "the one honoring the Son honors the Father."¹³ For in your naming the Son, you honor the Father, affirming Christ is not inferior to the Father.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

(1) For if among us men such a thought is absent and we do not wish our sons weaker nor inferior to the honor of their fathers (for a dishonor against sons is analogous to [dishonor] against fathers), how much more would God and Father not ever wish that his Son be inferior? (2) Accordingly the one who supposes that the Son, truly of the Father, is lacking the glory of the Father, rather dishonors <the Father>; instead of honor, he is being carried away by ignorance. (3) So, as <the Son> reveals the Father, saying, "No one knows the Father if not the Son, and no one knows the Son if not the Father,"¹ thus I dare to say that no one knows the Spirit if not the Father and the Son, from whom he [the Spirit] proceeds² and from whom he receives.³

8. Is 57.15 LXX.

9. Each instance of the term translated "enhypostatic" is ἐνυπόστατος/ν; see 67 n. 9.

10. Rom 8.9.

11. Cf. Jn 5.23.

12. Ath., *Ar.* 3.6.

13. Cf. Jn 5.23.

1. Mt 11.27.

2. Cf. Jn 15.26.

3. Cf. Jn 16.14. Also cf. *Anc.* 73.1.

(4) How do they dare to say that the Spirit is alien from God, those who especially are possessed by madness and not by truth, those who do not learn the true expression of the trustworthy and holy Paul the Apostle, to whom the chief of the Apostles, Peter, the one worthy to hold the keys of the kingdom, gave his right hand, the one [Paul] hearing from heaven: "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?"⁴ (5) the one being worthy to hear: "inexpressible statements, which are not permitted for a man to speak,"⁵ the one saying: "No one knows the things of man, except the spirit of man dwelling in him,"⁶ the one wishing from the illustration to declare the things above, in order that the illustration of the man might not represent God, but with the illustration he might reveal a part of things above? (6) For all creation, gathered together, of angels and archangels, of the Cherubim and Seraphim with the heavenly host, both of heaven and of earth, of earthly things, of heavenly things, and of things beneath the earth, both of luminaries and of stars, both of dry lands and of waters and of all things in general which are in heaven and on earth, is not able to display, nor with an analogy to be compared to, its master. (7) For according to grace he gives his image to man, saying: "God made man; according to the image of God he made him."⁷ For by a gift every man has the image, but no one will be likened to his master. (8) For one thing is invisible and the other visible; one is immortal and the other capable of death, and one is the whole fount of wisdom and has all things that have been perfected in himself. But the man who possesses a gift in part is left without the most perfect things, unless God wills to furnish perfect things through a gift, according to worth, to those who are being provided for.

CHAPTER TWELVE

(1) Nevertheless, having used an analogy, the same holy Apostle says, "No one man knows the things of man, except the spirit of the man dwelling in him: thus also no one knows the things of God."¹ (2) And it did not say, "except the Spirit of God

4. Acts 9.4.

5. 2 Cor 12.4.

6. 1 Cor 2.11.

7. Gn 1.27.

1. 1 Cor 2.11.

dwelling in him [God],” but only “the Spirit of God,” in order that no one might think that the divine is composite and composed. (3) “Except,” it says, “the Spirit of God”: “For the Spirit of God searches all things, even the depths of God.”² (4) Therefore, the Spirit is not alien from God, the one who searches the depths of God.³ For if the divine Scripture finds fault with us, saying: “What has been appointed to you, think on these things, and there is no need for you [to think on] the hidden things,”⁴ and “do not seek the things higher than you, and do not inquire into things deeper than you,”⁵ then shall we say also concerning the Holy Spirit that rather in vain and not rather in genuineness he searches the depths of God?⁶ (5) For where does he search the depths of God? On account of what cause? Speak, O fool! Out of curiosity? Meddling? Longing for things not his own? “By no means!”⁷ (6) But since the saints are deemed worthy to have the Holy Spirit dwell in them, when the Holy Spirit shall be in the saints, he gives to them grace to search the depths of God, to think deeply, as David also confesses this (for he says, “from the depths I cried to you Lord”),⁸ and with infinite greatness and not in a small and insignificant way, just as those of the heresy of Arius and all other outsiders [confess]. (7) And from the time when <the> Law was given through Moses, the heresies which were divided after him, before the incarnate *parousia* of Christ, are eleven, and after the incarnate *parousia* there were sixty others. Besides those before the Law were also five total and four other Greek heresies, which are nine before the Law. Together all, with their “mothers,” number eighty. (8) Of which the five “mothers” are thus: Barbarism, Scythianism, Hellenism, Judaism, Samaritanism.⁹ From these, out of Hellenism are four heresies: Pythagoreans, Platonists, Stoics, Epicureans. (9) After the Law, before <the> incarnate *parousia* of Christ, are eleven, out of Judaism seven: Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Ossaeans,

2. 1 Cor 2.10.

3. Cf. Bas., *Eun.*, 1.14, 3.4; *Spir.* 24.56.

4. Sir 3.22.

5. Sir 3.21.

6. Cf. Bas., *Spir.* 16.40.

7. Rom 6.2.

8. Ps 129.1.

9. For a discussion of how these “mother” heresies comprise an early history of humanity and sin, see Schott, “Heresiology as Universal History.”

Nasaraeans, Hemerobaptists, Herodians.¹⁰ And out of Samaritanism are four: Gorothenes, Sebuaeans, Essenes, Dositheans. Together after the Law were produced eleven out of Judaism and Samaritanism.¹¹

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

(1) So all those beginning after Adam, before the incarnate *parousia* of Christ and up to it, are twenty. After the incarnate *parousia* of Christ until the reign of Valentinian and Valens and Gratian, all the heresies, the ones falsely declaring the name of Christ for themselves, are sixty, thus being accounted: (2) Simonians, Menandrians, Satornilans, Basilideans, Nicolaitans, Gnostics (also being counted with them are the Stratiotics and Phibionites, Secundianitai among others, and Socratics with others, and Zacchaeans, and with them Koddians, (3) and Borborians <and Barbelites>); Carpocratians, Cerinthians (also known as Merinthians), Nazoraeans, Ebionites, Valentinians, Secundians (to whom are joined Epiphanes and Isidore); (4) Ptolemaeans, Marcosians, Colorbasians, Heracleonites, Ophites, Cainites, Sethians, Archontics, Cerdonians, Marcionites, Lucianists, Apelleans, Severians, Tatianists, (5) Encratites from Phrygia (also known as Montanists and Tascodrugians); Pepuzians (also known

10. I have adopted in most cases the orthographic conventions (generally Latinized and/or Anglicized) for the names of heresies used by Williams, *The Panarion*, vols. 1 and 2, in his translation of the *Pan*.

11. Epiphanius explained and refuted these pre-Incarnation heresies in the first twenty entries of the *Panarion*. For studies on how Christians constructed the Jews as heretics, see D. Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*; A. Cameron, “Jews and Heretics—A Category Error?” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95, ed. A. Becker and A. Reed (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 345–60; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); A. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); idem, *Christ Circumcised: A Study in Early Christian History and Difference*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), especially 100–114 for Epiphanius’s construction and location of “Jews” in his heresiological discourse.

as Priscillianists and Quintillianists, to whom are joined the Artotyrites); Quartodecimans, who make the Pascha one day of the year; Alogoi, who do not accept the Gospel and Apocalypse of John; Adamians, Sampsaean (also known as Elkasites); Theodotians, Melchizedekians, Bardesianists, Noetians, Valesians, Catharoi (also known as Navataeans and Novatianists, as they are called in Rome);¹ Angelics, Apostolics (<also known as> Apotactics); (6) Sabellians, Origenists, who do shameful things; Origenists, those of Adamantius; that [heresy] of Paul of Samosata, Manichaeans (also known as Acvanites); Hieracites, Melitians, who are a schism in Egypt; (7) Arians (also known as Ariomaniacs); the schism of the Audians, but not a heresy; Photinians, Marcelians, Semi-Arians, Pneumatomachoi, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit of God; (8) Aerians, Aetians (also known as Anomoeans, to whom is added Eunomius, but rather "Anomos");² Dimoerites, who do not confess the perfect Incarnation of Christ (<also known as> Apollinarians); and those whom we called Antidicomarians, who say that holy Mary, ever virgin, after she gave birth to the Savior, had relations with Joseph; and those who offer bread³ in her name, are called Collyridians; Messalians, to whom are added Martyrians (<who> are from the Greeks), Euphemites, and Satanians.⁴

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

(1) And frankly I was unfortunate and am unfortunate to present the names in sum of such heresies and to describe their

1. Μοντήσιοι was the name given to Novatianists in Rome, though apparently due to confusion with the Donatists. See Lampe, 884. Cf. Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2.4.

2. Epiphanius made a pun on the name of Eunomius, meaning "well-ordered," with "Anomos," or "lawless."

3. "bread" here = κολλυρίδα, from which the name of the heresy was derived.

4. This list of heresies corresponds with those which comprise the *Pan.* (see Proem 1), which implied that Epiphanius had already conceived of the future work to be done, though the letter from Acacius and Paul at the beginning of the *Pan.* suggested that it was a novel request. Nevertheless, Epiphanius could have established the list of heresies and the general framework certainly before the request. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 197, 204-7, argues that Epiphanius had already written drafts of certain sections of the *Pan.* before 373/374.

unlawful deeds, (2) and still of the two schisms, of the one in Egypt, I mean of the aforementioned Melitians, who separated themselves on account of the lapse of some that happened during the persecution, who, among their clergy, were accepted by ours after repentance. They are not in heresy.¹ (3) And those in Mesopotamia, the aforementioned Audians, in like manner are also a schism, but they do not have an alien faith, only amateurishly loving to dispute about [the phrase] “according to image,” not rebelling because of faith and not setting themselves apart because of some other thing. But according to an excessive desire for righteousness, indeed, because they do not commune with bishops and presbyters who have acquired gold and silver, and because they do celebrate the Pascha at the time when the Jews do, they both separate themselves because of these things and estrange themselves from the unity of the orthodox church. (4) For those who neither received the Holy Spirit nor learned the depths of God were broken off into these heresies and into the quibbling of schisms on account of a phrase. For, abandoning the truth, they marched toward many paths, at one time thinking one thing, at another time something else. (5) But the same holy Apostle [Paul] says, showing us through what cause he said this: “and we have received the Spirit of God, that we might know the things given to us from God. And what we say, not in words learned of human wisdom, but learned of the Holy Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to spiritual people,”² and what follows. Therefore, the Spirit of God is not alien from God.³ For if he is alien from God, how does he search the depths of God? (6) But what will you say to me, O vainglorious man, waging war on yourself, in order that I might not proclaim the Holy Spirit of God? For why, O vainglorious man, do you wage war on the

1. For an extended discussion of the Melitian schism, its sources, context, and consequences, see Martin, *Athanase d’Alexandrie*, 219–98; and specifically for Epiphanius’s perspectives, H. Hauben, “Épiphane de Salamine sur le schisme mélitien,” *Salesianum* 67.4 (2005): 737–70.

2. 1 Cor 2.12–13.

3. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.25.1: “And so, the Spirit is different from creatures and instead has been shown to be proper to the Son and not foreign to God” (trans. DelCogliano, Radde-Gallwitz, Ayres, *Works on the Spirit*, 92). See Morales, *La théologie*, 132–35.

invincible one? Why do you fight with the unconquerable one? "It is difficult for you to kick against goads."⁴ You offend yourself and not the *Logos*; you convict yourself and not the Spirit; you alienate yourself from the grace of God, and not the Son from the Father nor the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son.⁵

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

(1) For altogether you speak in a clever way. For already I heard that even some people have vain thoughts, changing the truth of our God and Savior into blasphemy and saying: "He searches the depths of God, but he does not comprehend," on account of this statement not being added to the phrase, but the Apostle only said, 'He searches the depths of God.'¹ And 'he comprehends' is not added." (2) O so much folly! For was it necessary, O man driven mad, after the saying "he searches," to say, "he comprehends"? For according to your dim wit, would the matter have been found defective with this phrase <not> being added? (3) Now no excuse remains for you. For from everywhere Scripture joins the truth to the most pious man. For concerning the almighty God it is written thus, that "God tests the mind"² and "searching the inner chambers of the heart."³ (4) And if he tests the "mind," does he not know what he tests? Or did he display all of his knowledge in the testing? "Searching the inner chambers of the heart," again does not add "comprehending." So if "he comprehends" is not added to the phrase, do I procure death for myself, having introduced "he does not comprehend" to the phrase, according to your argument, O fool? (5) So thus also concerning the Holy Spirit it has been said that "he searches,"⁴ and it was not necessary to say also that

4. Acts 26.14.

5. As with several other philosophical and/or theological words in this treatise, I have not directly translated *Λόγος*, in order to demonstrate the specific manner and context in which Epiphanius understood and used this term.

1. 1 Cor 2.10.

2. Jer 11.20; 17.10. Here, "mind" is literally "kidneys" or νεφρούς, which were considered to be the seat of good judgment. See Lampe, 907.

3. Prv 20.27.

4. 1 Cor 2.10.

“he comprehends.” According to the same argument, it is clear that the knowledge of God and of the depths of God is in the Holy Spirit. Even if it does not say “he comprehends,” think the same thing with me and do not destroy your soul. (6) For in respect of the Father, one must not dare to say, “he searches and does not comprehend,” (for with the Son and the Holy Spirit, he created man: for the Trinity is always Trinity and never receives an addition); indeed, one must also think thus about the Holy Spirit. (7) For whenever it says, “Let us make man”⁵ (“for in the beginning God made the heavens and the earth”),⁶ it indicates the voice of the Father calling together [with Son and Spirit] for creation. And the saying “Let us make”⁷ speaks not only, would I say, about the Son, <but> also <about> the Holy Spirit. (8) For thus it says, “by the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the breath of his mouth all their power.”⁸ Therefore, the *Logos* creates together with the Father, and the Holy Spirit also creates together [with them].⁹ (9) Therefore, does the one who made man, the almighty God, not know the things of man, “searching the inner chambers of the heart”?¹⁰ But the passage, saying this, infers the greatest part of the knowledge of God, in order that someone of those sinning among us might not believe something has been hidden from God. For he knows man and the things of man.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

(1) Therefore, the Father “searches the inner chambers of the heart”¹ and knows; the Spirit “searches the depths of God”² and knows. For he reveals to the saints the mysteries of God, and he teaches in a profound way to glorify God. And he shows the incomprehensibility of this to his own. (2) Then, at any rate, the Spirit is not alien from God. For it [Scripture] did not say about the angels or the archangels, “searching the depths

5. Gn 1.26.

6. Gn 1.1.

7. Gn 1.26.

8. Ps 32.6.

9. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.24.5-6, 2.13.4-14.1. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, 146-47.

10. Prv 20.27.

1. Ibid.

2. 1 Cor 2.10.

of God."³ "For no one knows the day or the hour,"⁴ says the Son of God, "neither the angels of heaven nor the Son, only the Father."⁵ (3) But fools, those who have not been adorned with the Holy Spirit, believe that something is not in the Father, wherefore it is not in the divinity of the Son. "For as the Father has life in himself, thus the Son has life in himself,"⁶ and "All things of my Father are mine,"⁷ says the same holy *Logos* of God.⁸ (4) What are the things of the Father but these things: deity is of the Father; this is also of the Son. Life is of the Father; this is also of the Son. Light is of the Father; clearly it is also of the Son. Immortality is of the Father; in like manner it is also of the Son. Incomprehensibility is of the Father and of the Son.⁹ (5) All the things of the Father are of the Son. Therefore, if the things of the Father are of him, then also the knowledge in the Father exists both in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. (6) And if someone believes the Son is ignorant of the day, let the stupid one learn and not blaspheme. For I offer knowledge to him, and he will know. Tell me, O beloved—for I call you "beloved." For I hate no one except the Devil and the works of the Devil and wicked belief. I pray for you, in order that you might come to the truth of God and not destroy yourself in blasphemy against God. (7) For the statements of the holy God are profound, and with the Holy Spirit <knowledge> is given through gifts of grace. "For to one," it says, "is the word of wisdom given, and to one the word of teaching,"¹⁰ and what follows, "the same Spirit allotting to each as he wills,"¹¹ in order that he might show to you the

3. One of the apparent claims of the *Tropikoi* was that the Holy Spirit was more akin to angels than to the divinity. Cf. also Did., *spir.* 25–28.

4. Mt 24.36.

5. Mk 13.32. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 2.9.1–4; *Ar.* 3.42–49; Bas., *ep.* 236.1–2, for explanations on the Son's knowledge of the hour of judgment and how his alleged ignorance was not at all the case.

6. Jn 5.26.

7. Jn 16.15.

8. See Morales, *La théologie*, 408–14, on how Athanasius used John 16.15 and an argument concerning common divine properties between Father and Son to prove the divinity of the latter.

9. Cf. *Pan.* 62.4.7 (the entry against Sabellianism); Ath. *ep. Serap.* 2.2.1–3.1.

10. 1 Cor 12.8.

11. 1 Cor 12.11.

supreme authority¹² of the Holy Spirit. (8) For since the same Spirit gives gifts to all as he wills, therefore call on the Father, in order that he might reveal to you the Son; and call on the Son, in order that he might reveal to you the Father. And again call on the Father, in order that he might give to you the Son and reveal to you the Holy Spirit, and grant you to have him in you, in order that the Holy Spirit given in you might reveal to you all knowledge of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, in order that you might learn that in the Son there is no ignorance, nor in the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

(1) For even if angels are lacking greater authority and knowledge, God forbid that the Son of God and his Holy Spirit are lacking. Spiritually the Son speaks, the holy *Logos* who came from the Father to us. The soulishly-minded¹ are condemned, not thinking of the wisdom of the Son, or rather the word of wisdom—I ask you, and you tell me: (2) who is greater, the Father or that day about which he speaks? May you not dare to say that the Father is not greater. Therefore, if the Father is greater than both the day and the hour and all things that by him have come to pass or are going to pass, and no one fully knows him except the Son, what then is greater, to know the Father or to know that day? Clearly to know the Father. (3) So how is the one who knows the greater things lacking in the lesser things? Therefore, if he knows the Father, he knows absolutely the day also, and there is nothing of which the Son is lacking with respect to knowledge. (4) But you will say that the Father, who is greater, has the knowledge of all things, and the Son in no wise, just as he also says, “My Father is greater than I.”² But the Son says this, honoring the Father, as was fitting, having been greatly honored by the Father. For it was truly necessary that

12. “supreme authority” = ἀθροῦντα.

1. “soulishly-minded” = ψυχικολ.

2. Jn 14.28. Cf. *Pan.* 69.43.1–47.6, for a parallel discussion of the Son and Spirit’s knowledge of the Day of Judgment, as well as other examples from the Old Testament. The shared knowledge thus affirms the divinity of the three Persons.

the genuine Son honor his own Father, in order that he might demonstrate his genuineness. (5) How do you believe that he is greater? In shape or in mass, in time, in season, in worth, in divinity, in immortality, in eternity?³ Do not believe these things. For nothing in the divinity is unequal with respect to the Son. But insofar as the Father is the Father and insofar as <the Son> is genuine Son, he honors his Father. (6) For the divinity is not borne in mass, that the Father might be greater in mass than the Son. Nor does he lapse in time, that the Father might be prior⁴ to the Son. Nor in height is the Father ranked in proportion (for he encompasses all things, himself being encompassed by nothing), that the Son might be thought to have surpassed him. For "he sat at the right hand of the Father,"⁵ and it [Scripture] did not say, "he entered into the Father," in order that it might put an end to Sabellius and might take down Arius from his blasphemy.⁶

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

(1) Because of this, do not seek the things that are not being sought, but honor the Son, in order that you might honor the Father. Hearing concerning God, "No one is good, except God alone,"¹ may you not dare, on account of the Son who exceedingly honors the Father, to declare that the Son is not good.² (2) For not even denying himself to be good, he says the Father is good, but in such a way more greatly he reveals himself in not wanting honor from men. But he offers honor to his own Father, in order that from the goodness of the Father the knowledge of the goodness of the Son of God might be known, he who has been begotten from the good Father God. (3) For there is much weakness for those who dare to say such a thing about the Son, even if he

3. Cf. Bas., *Eun.* 1.19-23, *Spir.* 6.15.

4. "prior" = ὑπέρχρονος.

5. Mk 16.19.

6. Epiphanius elaborated further on the topic of the Son and his knowledge of the hour and the day in *Pan.* 69.43.1-47.6.

1. Mk 10.18.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.57.1-7.

said, "There is one who is good, God."³ (4) For behold, in many ways the divine Scripture teaches us: calling good a poor and wise child;⁴ and, "Good was Samuel with God and men";⁵ and, "Good was Saul son of Kish from the tribe of Benjamin, highest of all Israel over shoulders and above";⁶ and, "It is good to go to a house of feasting";⁷ and, "Open, Lord, heaven, your good treasure";⁸ and, "A good word over a gift";⁹ and, "Good is the living dog over the dead lion";¹⁰ and, "Good are two over one";¹¹ and, "Good is the end of words over the beginning";¹² and, "If you who are wicked know to give good gifts to your children,"¹³ speaking about the fish and bread. (5) <So> how do you dare to think that the Son utterly denies his goodness and does not bear goodness on account of an abundance of honor <toward> his Father? (6) For he [Jesus] was seeing the one saying to him, "good teacher"¹⁴ (the one saying with his mouth and not his heart), and wishing to shame him, because he [Jesus] was not persuaded by his lip service. But he exposed his heart, as it says in another place, "Why do you say to me, 'Lord, Lord,' and do not do my words?"¹⁵ and in this way he was wishing to shame him. For he [the man] was calling him "good teacher" but was not abiding in faith in him [Jesus] to believe in his goodness.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

(1) Therefore, the holy *Logos* himself, the living one, the one who is enhypostatic,¹ the heavenly king, the genuine Son, the one <who is> always with the Father, the one who came forth from the Father, the "reflection of his glory, the impress of his *hypostasis*,"² "the image of the Father" in truth,³ the one enthroned

3. Mt 19.17.

6. 1 Sm 9.2.

9. Sir 18.17.

12. Eccl 7.8.

15. Lk 6.46.

4. Cf. Eccl 4.13.

7. Eccl 7.2.

10. Eccl 9.4.

13. Mt 7.11.

5. 1 Sm 2.26.

8. Dt 28.12.

11. Eccl 4.9.

14. Mk 10.17.

1. Again, the adjectival term Epiphanius used here was ἐνυπόστατος. See 67 n. 9, above.

2. Heb 1.3. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.20.1–5, on the "impress" imagery.

3. Col 1.15. Cf. Eusebius, *praeparatio evangelica* 7.15.2; *d.e.* 4.3 (147a–149b). See DelCogliano, "Eusebian Theologies," on Eusebius and other non-Nicene

with the one who begot,⁴ “of whose kingdom there will be no end,”⁵ (2) “the judge of the living and the dead,”⁶ the one who is wisdom from wisdom, the one who is the fount from fount (it says, “Me, they have left behind, the fount of living water, and they dug up shattered cisterns for themselves”),⁷ the ever-flowing river, the “one gladdening the city of God with his movements,”⁸ the one who came forth from the fount, “out of whom,” it says, “rivers flow from his heart,”⁹ (3) the scepter of David, the branch of Jesse, the blossom from it, the lion, the king from the tribe of Judah, (4) the rational sheep, the “living stone,”¹⁰ the “angel of great counsel,”¹¹ the one who has become man in truth and is God in truth, who did not change his nature, who did not alter his divinity, the one who was begotten in flesh, the *Logos* who was made flesh, the “*Logos* who became flesh,”¹² (5) the one who has flesh in the midst of the “becoming.” (For it does not say, “the *Logos*, the one who came to be.” But after the saying “the *Logos*,” unequivocally it puts the [word] “flesh.” But after “flesh” it says “he became,” in order that the “he became” might be approved from Mary, in order that the *Logos* might be thought as coming down from on high from the Father). (6) This one is the holy, living *Logos*, God from the Father, “the angel of great counsel,”¹³ the one who announces the things of the counsel of the Father, “Father of the coming eternity.”¹⁴ He himself said, “No one knows the day and the hour, neither the angels in heaven.”¹⁵ For they do not know that the Son says in a mystical sense,¹⁶ “except

interpretations of the Son as image. Epiphanius, in his belief that Father and Son are *homoousios*, would fundamentally disagree with Eusebius’s understanding of image language.

4. “begot” = φύσαντος.

5. Lk 1.33. This was a characteristically anti-Marcellan scriptural reference. See Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 64–66, on Marcellus’s belief in the end of Christ’s kingdom.

6. Acts 10.42.

7. Jer 2.13.

8. Ps 45.4.

9. Jn 7.38.

10. 1 Pt 2.4.

11. Is 9.5 LXX.

12. Cf. Jn 1.14.

13. Is 9.5 LXX.

14. Is 9.6.

15. Mk 13.32.

16. “mystical sense” = νοηματικῶς. According to Lampe, 916, this word is attested only in Epiphanius.

only the Father.”¹⁷ (7) Therefore, if the Son knows the Father, and the Father is greater than the day and the hour, and no one disagrees, how then is the one knowing the greater thing ignorant of the lesser?¹⁸ For no one knows the Father except the Son, and no one knows the Son except the Father.¹⁹ (8) For as the Father is great, because he knows the Son, thus also the Son is great, because he knows the Father. Therefore, if he knows the Father, the greater thing, how is he ignorant of a smaller thing, that is, the day and the hour? Search the divine Scriptures and learn the power of the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit himself, the one who knows the Father and the Son, will reveal to you the knowledge of the *Logos*, the Son of God, in order that you might not be led astray from the truth and destroy your soul.

CHAPTER TWENTY

(1) For there are two “knowledges” in divine Scripture, two forms of knowledge, one according to activity and one according to knowledge.¹ And in order that I might present like things from illustrations (for the explaining away, through many, of your erroneous thinking and that of those thinking this), (2) learn what the Scripture says concerning Adam: “They were,” it says, “naked in Paradise and were not ashamed.”² (3) And they were not blind, for they were seeing. For if they were not seeing, how did they see the tree, that was “good to eat and ripe for understanding”?³ “And taking,” it says, “the woman ate and also gave to her husband, the one with her.”⁴ (4) So then they were not blind, but their eyes were opened. And being naked, seeing, they were

17. Mk 13.32.

18. Cf. *Pan.* 69.43.5.

19. Cf. Mt 11.27.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 69.45.4–47.6. For “knowledges,” Epiphanius used γνώσεις, and for “forms of knowledge” he used εἰδήσεις in the plural. But, he distinguished between knowledge κατὰ ἐνέργειαν and the κατὰ εἶδησιν. See also Clement of Alexandria, *stromateis* 2.17, for an earlier reflection of different forms of knowledge.

2. Gn 2.25. Cf. *Pan.* 69.46.2.

3. Gn 3.6.

4. *Ibid.*

not ashamed, and they knew themselves, that they were naked. And they knew according to "knowledge" and not according to action.⁵ (5) For after the expulsion from Paradise, having eaten of the tree, after much time it says, "Adam knew Eve, his wife."⁶ (6) Therefore, how will this be? And indeed they were seeing one another being naked and knew themselves by sight, but not by action. But Scripture called the union with one another "knowledge."⁷ (7) But it knows to call "knowledge" as "knowledge."⁸ For again it says thus: "Jacob knew Leah his wife, and conceiving she gave birth."⁹ And he "knew" her first, for he was with her seven years tending the sheep of Laban, her father. He knew the knowledge through sight and through knowledge,¹⁰ but he did <not> know her through action. (8) "And he knew Rachel his wife,"¹¹ and again <in> another place: "And David grew old," it says, "and they were covering him with clothes, and he was not warmed. And they said, 'Let a beautiful virgin be sought for the king.'"¹² And Abishag the Shunammite was found. And it says, "She was brought to the king, and she lay with him and thoroughly warmed him. And David did not know her,"¹³ the one with him, the one in bodily contact with him and lying at his side. Then in what way does it say "knowledge"?¹⁴ (9) That through sight or through action? And "the Lord knew those who are his."¹⁵ So, then, is he ignorant of those who are not? And, "Away from me, doer of lawlessness, for I never knew you."¹⁶ Then is there ignorance in the Son of God? (10) And again "I knew you of all of the nations."¹⁷ So, then, is he ignorant of the remaining nations? "By no means!"¹⁸ But the divine Scripture knows "knowledge,"¹⁹ one according to knowledge, another according to action.

5. Here Epiphanius set *κατὰ εἶδῃσιν* in opposition to *κατὰ πράξιν* (a result of *ἐνέργεια*). He implied here that Scripture differentiated two forms of knowledge, one which was through perception and the other through action or doing.

6. Gn 4.1.

7. Here, *γνώσιν*.

8. In both instances, *εἶδῃσιν*.

9. Cf. Gn 29.21-32.

12. 1 Kgs 1.1-2.

15. 2 Tm 2.19.

18. Rom 6.2.

10. Here, *γνώσεως*.

13. 1 Kgs 1.3-4.

16. Lk 13.27.

19. Here, *γνώσιν*.

11. Cf. Gn 30.22.

14. Here, *εἶδῃσιν*.

17. Am 3.2.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

(1) So when the Only-begotten, who fulfills the will of the Father, already pointed out all things which have been completed, for the Father knew the hour and the day, knew it both according to knowledge and according to action.¹ For he himself knows all things, and in the Son saying, "The Father has given all judgment to the Son,"² although not judging on account of having given [this] to the Son, he himself [nevertheless] judges. For God has not been alienated from judging those who are being judged, and in not judging, the Father has already judged. (2) The Son knows when it comes: for he brings the day itself, and he determines and leads and completes [it]. For it [Scripture] says, "As a thief in the night that day comes,"³ and it says, "You are not in darkness, that the day may seize you in blindness."⁴ (3) So if the slaves of Christ are children of the day, then is the Son himself, who brings the day, ignorant, in order that the day may seize him, and he rather may not bring the day? Who thinking these things, will not be blaspheming, not reckoning the things that are clear about Father and Son? (4) And the Father knows the day and the hour according to two means, according to knowledge⁵ and according to action. For he knows when it [the day] comes; and again he has already judged ordaining that the Son judge, and he knew according to action. (5) The Son of God knows when it comes, and he himself brings it and is not ignorant. But he did not yet do this according to knowledge,⁶ that is to say, <he did not yet know> according to action. For still the impious are impious, and the unbelievers are unbelievers; and the wicked believers blaspheme, and the Devil operates. And sinful things come to be, and injustice rules; and judgment is slow, until he may come and may know

1. Holl found this sentence to be corrupt and offered his conjectures (in italics) to read as follows: "So when the Only-begotten, who fulfills the will of the Father, *was intending to bring judgment to the world*, he already pointed out all things which have been completed, *saying, 'the Father has given all judgment to the Son,'* for the Father knew the hour and the day, knew it both according to knowledge and according to action."

2. Jn 5.22.

3. 1 Thes 5.2.

4. 1 Thes 5.4.

5. Here, εἰδήσιν.

6. Here, γνῶσιν.

it [judgment] according to action, and may wreak vengeance, and may save those in truth who hope in him and do not blaspheme his divinity, and that of the Father and the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

(1) From the holy angels such a worthiness is lacking, according to the two ways. For they are held in honor, having obtained this from the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, but this is lacking for them: for they do not know when the things determined happen. For in his own authority the Father established the times. If the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, then the authority, that which is in the Father, is not lacking from the Son. But it is lacking from the angels. (2) For angels and archangels and powers are created, but the Father is uncreated; the Son is uncreated; the Spirit of God is uncreated. (3) So the angels do not know, either according to knowledge or according to action, the day and the hour. For they do not know when the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit will to bring forth the day, and they do not know according to the knowledge of action: for they were not yet ordered to go out and to gather together the weeds for punishment and to bind them in bundles, bundles in order to light them in an unquenchable fire.¹ (4) Therefore, they did not yet do [this] nor do they know, but the Father knows and did [this]. And the Son knows, but did not yet do. That is to say, "except only the Father, neither the angels nor the Son."² (5) Let us think on the meaning of the Scripture, in order that the letter might not be death for us. For it says, "The letter will kill, but the Spirit makes alive."³ Let us receive the Spirit, in order that we might be aided from the letter. For the letter will not kill, for in the letter is life. But it will kill the one who approaches the letter without understanding and not having the Spirit who shows the way, the one who opens the letter and reveals what is in it. (6) So this holy Father gave his only-begotten, genuine Son, who has been begotten from him,

1. Cf. Mt 13.30.

2. Mt 24.36.

3. 2 Cor 3.6.

and his Holy Spirit, to his holy Church in one knowledge of harmony, in one bond of perfection, in order that in the name of the perfect Father and God we might receive the seal. And in the name of the perfect Son and of God and in the name of the divine and perfect Spirit we might receive the seal. (7) O holy Trinity, which is reckoned [as three], Trinity, which is reckoned in one name. For it is not said one and two, nor one and one,⁴ but unity⁵ in Trinity and Trinity in unity, singly, mononymically,⁶ one God, Father in Son, Son in Father with Holy Spirit.⁷

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

(1) Summon for me the witnesses of the truth! Summon for me the youths, the ones who were saved from the furnace of Babylonia,¹ the ones who were deemed worthy to be thrown into the fire, but who were not consumed, who did not extinguish the fire, in order that they might not be suspected of contriving in opposition new things, but who were in the fire and in the fire were not consumed on account of their right faith. And God teaches us through them: on the one hand, what things are created; on the other hand, what are uncreated, what things are made, what things did not come to be, what things are eternal, what things are from them, which came to be. (2) Such saved youths desired to display their grateful thoughts to God who saved them, in whom from the beginning they had hoped and did not doubt, and they did not bow their heads to the idol, to the insolence of the king and to his despotism. (3) And when they wished to ascribe something to God, having searched out the deep things with the Holy Spirit in their hearts, being holy men, they thought about both heaven and all things in it, and the earth and all things on it and all things so far as they exist, that they are not worthy to be offered to God for a sacrifice (for they did not have authority to offer to God things on behalf of themselves). (4) And according to worth and according to authority, they wish only to sing hymns to

4. Here for both, *μονάς*.

5. Also *μονάς*.

6. See 72 n.1, above.

7. Cf. Bas., *Spir.* 18.45.

1. Cf. Dn 3.1-30.

God (for this is what has been written: "make offerings of praise" and "an offering of praise will honor me"),² already turning the Old Testament into the New, having been spurred on by the Holy Spirit, having neither sacrifices of animals nor the use of burnt-offerings (for they say, "There is not a means of offering, neither a sacrifice nor an altar,"³ as with all who have been restrained). (5) But wishing to offer such praise and conceding their limitations, they behaved humbly ("for all who exalt themselves will be humbled, and all humbling themselves will be exalted": with the gift of their salvation they receive also this gift of humility),⁴ and they wish to offer praise to God and not to lose heart. (6) And approving themselves for the unspeakable praise of God, they thought fit to include together with themselves the creation for praise, and they begin to speak having included together all creation.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

(1) Distinguishing the things made from the one who made and the things created from the one who created, they say, "Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord."¹ (2) They spoke about all things and omitted nothing, in order that the Holy Spirit might characterize the perfect knowledge in regard to knowing, what sort is divine and what sort came to be by God, in order that we might not mix with the eternal the things which came to be out of nothing. In order that we might not destroy our own thinking, he brought together all things in an accounting. For the Holy Spirit revealed to them, (3) as those deemed worthy at the same time to be with the angels <and> having become companions with angels, the things in heaven and on the earth and the things beneath the earth, and then they were not ignorant. (4) And the same holy youths say, as they said before: "Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord,"² and they began

2. Ps 106.22; 49.23.

3. Cf. Dn 3.38 LXX.

4. Lk 18.14.

1. Dn 3.57 LXX.

2. Ibid.

to reckon and to distinguish what are the works, what are the things that have made, what are the things working, and what things were worked. (5) And they accounted for heaven, earth, waters above heaven, and angels (for the angels are created) and thrones and powers (for these are created), sun, moon (for these were made and are not uncreated), clouds and rain, winds, snow, lightning, thunder, earth, sea, streams, depths, rivers, all humanity, mountains, birds of the sky, flocks and animals, souls of the devout, spirits of the just, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, priests and slaves of God. (6) For all these things are made and created, having come into being by God through the *Logos* and the Holy Spirit: “for by the word of the Lord the heavens were established and by the breath of his mouth all their power.”³ (7) See, beloved brother, how they accounted for all things, being borne by the Holy Spirit; and they did not account the Son among the things made, and neither the Holy Spirit.⁴ But they knew the same divinity to be in Trinity and the same Trinity to be in one divinity. And they praised the Father in the Son, and Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, one holiness, one worship, one divinity, one praise.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

(1) But altogether the Devil dares to rouse this in men, to allege falsely the insolence of unbelief for the holy young men, and to say: “They did not know to speak the name of the Holy Spirit. For they were Jews, and they did not know the Son, being Jews.” (2) At once the words put to shame the unbelief of the false believers. For it says, “And the face of the fourth person was as the face of a Son of God.”¹ Behold the name of “Son of God.” Then there is no ignorance concerning this. And before the time in the oven, [it says] that “Daniel was full of the Holy Spirit and said, ‘I am clear of her blood,’ and they turned their

3. Ps 32.6.

4. Ath., *Ar.* 2.71.

1. Dn 3.25. Here Epiphanius identified a theophany with the pre-Incarnate Son.

attention to the tribunal";² and he, being filled with the Holy Spirit, judged the elders. (3) So then they knew the Son, and they knew the Father and the Holy Spirit. And not on account of ignorance were they not saying the names, but for the sake of certainty. For <it says,> "Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord,"³ and they were not saying, "Bless the Lord, [you] Son of God," nor, "Bless the Lord, [you] Holy Spirit," but, "Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord."⁴ (4) And someone among those searching for excuses for themselves should not say: "Because they did not say Cherubim or Seraphim, then these are not the works of God." For the divine word anticipated to safeguard all things against those thinking of contrivances for themselves, knowing in advance the outrage against the young men themselves. (5) For three times the same holy youths repeated the hymn, citing the created and made things in a hymn of God and first having said, "Blessed are you, Lord, God of our fathers, and your name is to be praised and exalted highly forever,"⁵ then after other things, "Blessed are you, the one seated upon the Cherubim,"⁶ and again, "Blessed are you, the one seated on the throne of glory of your kingdom,"⁷ and, "Blessed are you, the one who sees the depths, seated upon the Cherubim."⁸ (6) In order that from the saying "the throne," you might think Seraphim and Cherubim, and from the name of the Cherubim and of the depths and of the sanctified throne, and from all the remaining names, you might think, from the accounting of all the things that were named, that from the works they are being accounted for together with the others. For having invoked all these things in a hymn, straightaway they offer, saying: "Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord,"⁹ in order that Gabriel and Michael might bless the Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

2. Cf. Sus 45-49, or Dn 13.45-49 Vg.

3. Dn 3.57 LXX.

6. Dn 3.55 LXX.

9. Dn 3.57 LXX.

4. Ibid.

7. Cf. Dn 3.54 LXX.

5. Cf. Dn 3.52 LXX.

8. Dn 3.55 LXX.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

(1) Revered angels in heaven sing the triumphal hymn, with the Seraphim and Cherubim, glorifying the Trinity as having the same glory, equal rank, and the same substance,¹ and saying, "Holy, Holy, Holy,"² producing three expressions, speaking in unity and not polynymically.³ (2) For they do not say "holy" four times, in order that they not add to the name of the Trinity. They do not say "holy" twice, in order that the glory of the perfection might not be lacking, but three times, in order that they might sanctify the Father and Son and Holy Spirit with the same honor. (3) And they do not say "holy" and "semi-holy," but in the same way they say "holy," with one expression and one word and one perfection, glorifying together Trinity in unity, and unity in Trinity. (4) For the Only-begotten of God came to teach us this knowledge; the Holy Spirit proclaimed this understanding to us; the Father revealed this perfection to us. In truth the *Logos* made flesh gave as a gift this life to us; the Holy Spirit built this dwelling for us. (5) "For if someone builds on this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw ..." ⁴ For there is not another foundation: "For no one is able to lay another foundation besides the one laid, which is Jesus Christ," ⁵ the Son of God, "of whose dwelling we are, and of whose field we are," ⁶ "built upon the foundation of the prophets and the apostles," ⁷ of knowing that our dwelling is solid in truth and that our foundation is eternal and not beginning to be. (6) But "the knowledge is not in all," ⁸ according to the apostolic word, but in those deemed worthy by the Holy Spirit to know the mysteries of the truth. (7) For he, who revealed himself and his Father and the Holy Spirit, casting blame on some who were in ignorance, was saying: "You do not know the Scrip-

1. Each of these descriptive elements ("same glory," "equal rank," and "same substance") is expressed by an adverb. The last adverb in the series (*ὁμοουσίως*) could be translated literally as "in a *homoousios* way."

2. Is 6.3.

3. Cf. *Anc.* 10.1-5, 73.9. On the contrast with "mononym," see *Anc.* 8.1-9.

4. 1 Cor 3.12.

5. 1 Cor 3.11.

6. 1 Cor 3.9.

7. Eph 2.20.

8. 1 Cor 8.7.

tures nor their power";⁹ and again elsewhere, "The one who has ears to hear, let him hear."¹⁰ And again, "If you knew who is the one seeking [something] to drink from you, you would seek,"¹¹ he was saying to the Samaritan woman, and again, "You"¹² do not know of what spirit you are."¹³ (8) So then, "The knowledge is not in all":¹⁴ "For each one has distinctive gifts from God."¹⁵ And the holy word says, "To whom has been given much, much will be demanded of him,"¹⁶ as with some receiving few, some not at all, and others having received much.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

(1) And because these things are thus, one is able to discover from what was said in the divine Scriptures. For because the divine Scripture speaks most things spiritually, particularly concerning our life, and I say concerning the knowledge of the Lord, how much deeper and more extraordinary are the statements securing our soul; these have come together as a stumbling-block to those who have not laid hold of the knowledge of God, (2) as the prophet Hosea said, "Who is intelligent and will understand these things?"¹ and, "To whom the word of knowledge of the Lord is given, he will know the very things: that straight are the ways of the Lord, and the impious will stumble on them."² (3) For they are straight, but the impious stumble <on> the ways of the Lord, with these things being innocent of being a stumbling-block to men. At any rate, the ones stumbling on the stone of stumbling stumble indiscriminately: "for they stumbled on the stone of stumbling"³ and fell. (4) For straightaway the Jews, seeing the only-begotten Son of God, who came in flesh performing miracles, and, since they were not deemed worthy of the heavenly knowledge, were saying: "Who is this man, who speaks blasphemy?"⁴ and at another time, "If

9. Mt 22.29; Mk 12.24.

10. Mk 4.9.

11. Jn 4.10.

12. The second person plural is used in this sentence.

13. Lk 9.55.

14. 1 Cor 8.7.

15. 1 Cor 7.7.

16. Lk 12.48.

1. Hos 14.10 LXX.

2. Ibid.

3. Rom 9.32.

4. Lk 5.21.

this man were from God, he would not break the Sabbath.”⁵ So, then, they were ignorant of the divinity, and they were believing him only a mere man.⁶ (5) But those who even knew God himself, <but> being ignorant of his perfect glory, having heard the statements which were said in depth concerning him and concerning the economy undertaken for our salvation, erring against his divinity, hold false beliefs.⁷ (6) For their thinking tripped them up. For as the Jews, having heard, erred, thus also they, hearing, were erring. For the former [the Jews] were seeing what was said before in the prophets. But being ignorant that they [things said in prophets] were fulfilled in the incarnate *parousia* of Christ, they stirred up trouble. (7) And the latter [Arians], again hearing what was said before on account of his economy, but merely thinking such things, stir trouble and propose, to their own undoing, the things <which were said> in regard to our “dwelling,” and they say: but he [Christ] said, “I am leaving to my God and your God and my Father and your Father.”⁸ “You see that he also is one of the created beings,” they dare to say blaspheming.⁹

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

(1) Therefore, you see that the economy of the incarnate *parousia* causes them to fall. For they might have received from the beginning and might have asked about times or seasons: “for

5. Jn 9.16.

6. “mere man” = ψιλὸν ἀνθρώπων (in a slightly different word order). Cf. *Pan.* 24.8.6, 29.7.6, 30.17.1, 30.18.6, 30.20.1, 30.20.5, 30.26.9, 30.29.1–10, 30.34.6, 51.4.2 (referencing Cerinthus), 51.6.7, 51.18.4, 54.1.8, 57.2.9 (referencing Theodotus), 65.7.4 (against Paul of Samosata), 69.23.1, 69.61.6, 77.32.8. This charge had particular traction in the fourth century, and it was hurled by both pro- and non-Nicenes against one another. Epiphanius attacked the notion of Christ as “mere man,” as evident in the preceding references, in particular in his entry against the Ebionites (*Pan.* 30).

7. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 192–93, identifies this group, the Arians, as the second of the two types of false believers introduced in this section.

8. Jn 20.17.

9. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.27, where Athanasius made a similar juxtaposition between Jewish and Arian false beliefs.

his pathways," it says, "are from ancient days."¹ Therefore, let us observe the things before these. The Father says, "Let us make man according to our image and according to our likeness,"² and he did not say, "Let me make man according to my image."³ (2) Be reprovéd, you who have a heart that has been hardened, according to what has been written, "but their hearts were hardened,"⁴ and learn that the Son is he who is always with the Father. For the saying "Let us make"⁵ is not indicative of one, but of Father speaking to the Son. (3) Be reprovéd also, you who say that the Son is unlike⁶ the Father. For in the saying itself "according to our image,"⁷ he did not distinguish a likeness of Son from that of Father, nor did he divide anything from the identity of the Father with the Son. For he did not say, "according to my image" or "according to your image," but he indicated one *ousia* and one divinity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. For he says, "according to our image and likeness,"⁸ so that it is one divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and that man has come to be according to the image of the one divinity of Father and Son and Holy Spirit.⁹ (4) Be reprovéd also, Arius, and hear the Father, who says to the Son, "Let us make,"¹⁰ calling the Son "co-creator."¹¹ For often I have heard some people saying that the Son made nothing, but "through him came to be" the things which came to be.¹² But if it came to be through him, he also made it, as it has been demonstrated clearly. (5) For the architect of all things, the *Logos*, is the maker, and through him the Father works. For let them listen to him who clearly says, "My Father works until now, and I

1. Mi 5.2. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 194–98, views this section up to *Anc.* 29.2 as an excursive break in the flow of thinking from the previous section.

2. Gn 1.26.

3. Cf. *Pan.* 65.8.8, 69.55.4 for parallel explanations of the biblical verse.

4. Mk 6.52.

5. Gn 1.26.

6. ἀνόμοιον.

7. Gn 1.26.

8. Ibid.

9. Cf. *Pan.* 76.6.9, where Epiphanius interpreted Gn 1.26 to refute the Heteroousian (Anomoian) notion that the Son is unlike the Father, and 76.19.6, where he interpreted the same verse and also applied it to the Holy Spirit. See also Bas., *Eun.* 1.18. Contrast with Eus., *d.e.* 5.1 (215a–216c).

10. Gn 1.26.

11. The term for "co-creator" is συνδημιουργός (in the accusative in the text).

12. Jn 1.3.

am working.”¹³ And in this way he calls his Father “co-creator,” in saying this. (6) But again do not let your thinking deceive you, and do not draw near to the Son as if to a servant and not to a true master. For if he was a slave and not true master, how did the one who came, being in the form of God, assume the form of a slave?¹⁴ And how could he empty himself, if he did not have completion?¹⁵ So as to perfect God, draw near to the Son, even to the genuine Son who is from beside the Father.

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

(1) And do not speak through malice. But the Father said to the Son, “Let us make,”¹ and the Son did not say to the Father, “Let us make.” And the Son does not say, “I work and my Father works,” but he orders the Father first, the one who speaks and works. (2) For you say this foolishly, and you wish to think that the divine is many beginnings. There is one beginning and the same one divinity, and nowhere here does the Son say “my God.”² I speak not denying the honor of the Son toward his Father, but [I speak] about how the ordering³ of the divinity holds. (3) And again it says, “Adam heard God walking in Paradise in the evening.”⁴ And nowhere does the Son say, “my God and your God,”⁵ but he says here “God,” complete in himself.⁶ (4) And again, “and God spoke to Noah,”⁷ and nowhere is such a phrase mentioned. (5) “And God appeared,” it says, “to Abraham, with him sitting near to the tree at Mamre. And behold, three men [appeared], and he ran to meet them and bowed to the earth to worship and said: ‘If I have found favor before you,’”⁸ in order that he might point out the one God, and the two others following him, his angels. (6) For concerning this

13. Jn 5.17. Cf. *Pan.* 71.4.1-8, where Epiphanius refuted Photinus’s explanation of the *Logos* as the Father’s reason.

14. Cf. Phil 2.6.

15. Cf. Phil 2.7.

1. Gn 1.26.

2. Jn 20.17. Cf. *Pan.* 69.55.1-5.

3. “ordering” = ἀκολουθία.

4. Gn 3.8.

5. Jn 20.17.

6. Cf. *Pan.* 69.55.5.

7. Gn 6.13; 7.1; 9.12.

8. Gn 18.1-3.

also <it says>, "God went up from Abraham."⁹ And the very one who came to him says, "Shall I hide something from my child Abraham?"¹⁰ "An outcry," it says, "of Sodom and Gomorrah to me has increased,"¹¹ and what follows. And nowhere does it mention in those times [the phrase] "my God and your God."¹² (7) "And two men entered into Sodom,"¹³ as the one who went up above from Abraham left the two entering into Sodom for its destruction. Concerning the "one who went up above,"¹⁴ the Scripture says, "and the Lord rained down on Sodom and Gomorrah, fire and brimstone from the Lord."¹⁵ And there was no use of the phrase that says, "my God and your God."¹⁶ (8) And Moses says in his song, "and let all the angels of God bow down and worship him."¹⁷ If it says "angels of God" and "fire from the Lord," and does not say "angels" only, [it does] in order that it might point out one sovereign authority of the Father and of the Son, with the angels not having a share in the beginnings, but existing from God, bowing down to worship the Son and God. For an angel does not bow down to worship an angel. And nowhere here is "my God and your God."¹⁸

CHAPTER THIRTY

(1) David says, "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right hand, until I have made your enemies a stool for your feet.'"¹ "Lord," it says, "to my Lord": for the economy of the flesh was not yet, on account of which there was a need for him to say "my God and your God."² (2) "Behold, the virgin will conceive in her womb and will bear a son, and you shall call his name Emmanuel, which is translated, 'God with us.'"³ And there was not yet <the need> for saying "my God and your God."⁴ (3) And "you, Bethlehem, home of Ephrathah, are not one of the smallest among the thousands in Judah. For from you will come for

9. Gn 18.33.

12. Jn 20.17.

15. Gn 19.24.

18. Jn 20.17.

10. Gn 18.17.

13. Gn 19.1.

16. Jn 20.17.

11. Gn 18.20.

14. Gn 18.33.

17. Dt 32.43.

1. Ps 109.1.

4. Jn 20.17.

2. Jn 20.17.

3. Is 7.14; Mt 1.23.

me the one to rule in Israel, and his paths are from the beginning, from ancient days,”⁵ and according to other copies, “and you Bethlehem, not the smallest among the chiefs of Judah. For from you will come one leading, and he will shepherd my people Israel.”⁶ And you see that there was not yet need to say “my God and your God.”⁷ (4) But when the prophecy of Jeremiah and Isaiah was fulfilled in like manner, that the *Logos* was born from a virgin and had flesh, just as Jeremiah says, “and he is a man. And who will know him?”⁸ Then having partaken of the flesh and without the seed of man, from the *Theotokos* Mary, having formed the same holy flesh for himself (according to that which was said “came to be from a woman”),⁹ and having partaken of that which is ours on our behalf, he says, “my God.”¹⁰ (5) Because of the eternality of his genuineness according to his nature, he says, “my Father,” and because of his grace to his disciples, “your Father.” But because of the nature of his disciples, in reference to his divinity and that of his eternal Father, [he says] “your God.”¹¹ (6) For he is God of the disciples and Father of the Lord according to nature, but Father of the disciples according to grace.¹² And the Father, on account of the flesh, is God of the Son, but he is Father on account of the eternality and incomprehensibility of his generation and genuineness, because in truth he is his Father, who begot him non-temporally and without beginning according to the divinity.¹³ (7) It was necessary to say his “God,” on account of the economy, which he carried out for our sake, he who is always with the Father, the *Logos* begotten without beginning, but in the flesh from Mary

5. Mi 5.2.

6. Mt 2.6.

7. Jn 20.17.

8. Jer 17.9.

9. Gal 4.4.

10. Jn 20.17. Epiphanius was emphasizing here that only after the Son assumed human flesh in the Incarnation did he ever say, “my God.” In all of the prior examples of theophanies of the Son from the Hebrew Scriptures, he never said, “my God” and “your God.”

11. Jn 20.17. Cf. *Pan.* 69.55.6.

12. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.17–22.

13. Cf. Cyr. H., *catech.* 7.7–9, who made a parallel argument on the meaning of “Father” respectively for Christ and for men, the former “by nature” and the latter “by adoption.” On Epiphanius’s understanding of “according to nature” as equivalent to *ousia*, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 200, n. 392.

at the end of days, born according to flesh from Mary, the same holy Virgin, through the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

(1) Therefore, may they think about the depths of the action of God, and may they not turn his grace into ingratitude, reckoning his salvation for us a disgrace, against the ineffable and incomprehensible nature of God. (2) But, they say, concerning God it has been written: "He will neither hunger nor thirst, nor is there a searching of his purpose,"¹ and concerning the Son, that he hungered in the desert to the point of temptation.² And it says, "Our God will not grow weary,"³ but the Lord Jesus grew weary on the journey.⁴ And "The one who protects Israel will neither slumber nor sleep,"⁵ but it says the Lord slept in the boat.⁶ (3) O how vain are the opinions of those who reckon such things! For not only did the holy *Logos*, who came on our behalf, take up our burdens, but he also became subject to [human] contact and assumed flesh, and he was found a man and was seized by the scribes. And, "I gave my back to the whip, and I did not turn my face away from the disgrace of those spitting."⁷ (4) But also "he wept."⁸ It is found in the Gospel according to Luke in unrevised copies (and the holy Irenaeus has used the testimony in his *Against Heresies* against those who said that Christ has shown himself [only] in appearance, but the orthodox have removed the passage, frightened and not thinking about the end of it [the passage] and its most powerful meaning). (5) And, "Having come to be in agony he sweated, and his sweat became as drops

1. Cf. Is 40.28.

2. Cf. Mt 4.2; Lk 4.2. In *Pan.* 69.48.1-4, Epiphanius argued against "Arian" attempts to differentiate the *ousia* of the Father and the Son through the exegesis of these biblical passages referring to the nature of God (the Father) and these examples of human weakness exhibited by the Son.

3. Is 40.28.

4. Cf. Jn 4.6.

5. Ps 120.4.

6. Cf. Mt 8.24; Mk 4.38; Lk 8.23.

7. Is 50.6.

8. Lk 19.41.

of blood, and an angel appeared strengthening him.”⁹ (6) Not only this, but also as a man he asked: “Where have you placed Lazarus?”¹⁰ and concerning the one hemorrhaging blood, “Who touched me?”¹¹ and concerning those seeking him, “Whom do you seek?”¹² But also as a man he asked his disciples: “Who do men say that I am, the Son of Man?”¹³ but also he was saying, “How many loaves have you among yourselves?”¹⁴ (7) And having grown weary from the journey, he sat down by the well in Samaria, but also [it says]: “The child was growing and becoming strong in spirit”;¹⁵ and “Jesus was advancing in age and in wisdom”;¹⁶ and “Before the child knows to call ‘father’ or ‘mother,’ he will take the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria.”¹⁷ (8) He who is wisdom also “teaching men knowledge and planted the ear in man,”¹⁸ and articulating speech in the sons of men, “and having made the tongue of the speechless clear.”¹⁹ All such things he endured on our behalf, in order that having preserved the entire ordering of the Incarnation assumed on our behalf, he might not conceal the character of the truth.

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

(1) But in order that we might not allow the testimonies, which we presented (as from the face of those who collected

9. Lk 22.43–44. Cf. Irenaeus, *adversus haereses* 3.22.2, against a Docetic Christology. For a discussion on the (mistaken) textual conjecture suggested by Holl and to which biblical text Irenaeus and Epiphanius referred, see U. Holzmeister, “Spricht Epiphanius (*Ancoratus* 31,4) vom Blutschweiß des Herrn oder von seinen Tränen,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 47 (1923): 309–14, and the discussion in Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 202–3, n. 402. Holl added a <ὥς> after “he wept,” which would imply that the problematic text was Lk 19.41, whereas the real issue seems to have been over the text that follows, Lk 22.43–44. I follow Holzmeister and Kösters in rejecting Holl’s conjecture; furthermore, they add a period to end the citation of Lk 19.41, thus connecting the statement on Irenaeus to the verse that follows. Epiphanius later (*Anc.* 37.1–7) elaborated on what the “angel appeared strengthening him” meant.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| 10. Jn 11.34. | 11. Mk 5.30; Lk 8.45. | 12. Jn 18.4. |
| 13. Mt 16.13. | | |
| 14. Mk 6.38. Cf. Ath., <i>Ar.</i> 3.37. | | |
| 15. Lk 2.40. | 16. Lk 2.52. | 17. Is 8.4. |
| 18. Ps 93.9–10. | 19. Is 35.6. | |

from the divine Scriptures because of opposition against the truth), which are being contradicted and being thought about wickedly by them, thus to be uninterpreted, of each I will speak about the spiritual sense¹ of the meaning in it, for which cause thus [each] has been spoken about in a human way. (2) And again we will speak, <already> having spoken many things on "my God and your God,"² since it can be said reasonably that for the one having a mind, he knows from the very ordering. (3) "For he is a man, and who will know him?"³ In this the divine Scripture brings to light two things, both what is visible and what is invisible: on account of what is seen on the one hand it says reasonably "my God,"⁴ and on account of what is unseen on the other hand it says, "my Father," neither of which result is contradictory to reason.⁵ (4) For how, if he was a man, was he not known? But if he was not a man, how as a man was he spoken of? (5) For altogether everyone who came to be from men is known by men, by the one who gave birth to him, by his family, by his household, by his neighbors, by his comrades or fellow citizens. (6) And this is not able to be fulfilled in a mere man, but it is fulfilled in the divine *Logos* and Son of God, in the saying, "he is a man,"⁶ in truth, "who will know him?"⁷ because he is God. For which reason he partook with men, and as God he is unknown by men on account of his incomprehensibility. (7) But he was a man from Mary in truth, having been born apart from the seed of man: "and the virgin," it says, (for the prophet was declaring the future before that time) "will bear in her womb and bring a child into the world."⁸ (8) Therefore, if she was a virgin, not from men was the economy of the conception, because of what was said before this time to Ahaz, "a sign will be sought by you in the deep or in the heights."⁹ The one of humble mind says, "I will not ask nor will I test the Lord my God,"¹⁰ having declined the sign to be sought. (9) Straight-

1. "spiritual sense" = *θεωπλᾶν*.

2. Jn 20.17.

3. Jer 17.9.

4. Jn 20.17.

5. Cf. Gr. Naz., *orationes theologicae* 30.8.

6. Jer 17.9.

7. Ibid.

8. Is 7.14.

9. Ibid.

10. Is 7.12.

away, on account of that sign which was not sought, God, who presents great gifts to men, freely gives twice: from on high he sent the *Logos* by his own will and by the very will of the *Logos* himself, and from the depths he ordained the economy of the flesh by his own good pleasure with the *Logos* himself. (10) For it later says, “and they will call his name Emmanuel.”¹¹ And it did not say “I will call,” but “they will call.” For God, the one ever unknown by them, was revealed to men. But he does not receive the name recently: for it did not say, “I will call his name Emmanuel,” but “they will call.”¹²

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

(1) The phrase is “came to be from a woman,”¹ just as I have explained above, in order that in “from a woman,” “came to be” might be fulfilled, and that the eternal *Logos* might be shown clearly to all. And if “he will not thirst”² is a word [said] concerning God, but concerning the Son, that he “hungered and thirsted,”³ then there is a need for this to be treated by us. (2) For how was the economy found to be in truth, if he was not having the necessary custom of the incarnate state? In this it [the Scripture] showed to us the solutions to all of the questions of the heretics. (3) For straightaway it destroyed the opinion of the Manichaeans: for in the saying, “to eat” and “to drink,” it indicates true flesh. It destroyed the way of the Lucianists and the power of Arius: (4) for Lucian and all Lucianists deny that the Son of God has assumed a soul, and they say he has had only flesh, in order that they might actually attribute human passion to the God-*Logos*, thirst and hunger, labor and weeping, pain and distress, and as much as pertains to his incarnate *parousia*.⁴ But it would be foolish to reckon these things to the divinity of the Son of God. (5) But,

11. Is 7.14.

12. Ibid.

1. Gal 4.4.

2. Is 40.28.

3. Mt 4.2; Lk 4.2.

4. On the connection, if any, between the theology of Lucian of Antioch and Arius, see above, 18 n. 49.

they say, "flesh" existing in accordance to itself neither eats nor drinks nor labors nor does any other things. And I myself agree that flesh in accordance to itself does not have these things. (6) But the *Logos* who came was possessing the entire economy, both flesh and soul and as much as is in a man.⁵ Part of the soul and of the flesh was hunger and labor, thirst and pain, and the other things. (7) For he weeps, in order that he might put to shame the error of the Manichaean, because he had not been clothed with the body in appearance, but in truth.⁶ And he thirsts, in order that he might show that he was possessing not only the flesh, but also the soul. For his divinity did not thirst anywhere, <but in the flesh> and in the soul he thirsted and wearied from the journey because of the ordering of the flesh and of the soul.⁷

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

(1) That the *Logos* came, having body and soul, let the divine Scriptures, both old and new, persuade them. For David says directly concerning him, and Peter agrees with David: "You will not allow my soul into Hades, nor will you give your holy one to experience ruin":¹ in order that the composition of the Lord's-man would be thought about and the knowledge concerning him might become clear to us, in order that he might unite the soul with the divinity <along with the flesh> to be buried together for three days, in order that he might show the holy flesh, and [show that] the divinity with the soul has perfected the mystery irrepressibly in Hades.² (2) There is somewhere

5. Cf. *Pan.* 69.49.1-2; *Ath., ep. Serap.* 2.7.1-8.3.

6. Cf. *Pan.* 66.26.5, a quotation from Mani's teaching. Also *Ath., Ar.* 1.53, on the Manichaean denial of the Incarnation.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 69.19.7-8; *Ath., Ar.* 3.34.

1. *Ps* 15.10; *Acts* 2.27.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.64.1-5, also on the natures of Christ and the descent to Hades. On the historical and theological development of the concept of "the Lord's-man" or ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος, see A. Grillmeier, "Ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος: Eine Studie zu einer christologischen Bezeichnung der Väterzeit," *Traditio* 33 (1977): 1-63, especially 33-42 for its use by authors of the fourth century, including Epiphanius. Grillmeier mistakenly claimed that Epiphanius only used this term twice, once here, and once in *Pan.* 69.64, but he rightly identified the

another testimony that says thus: “among the dead, free.”³ The word “free” is not indicative of Hades ruling over him, but that by his own will he has descended as far as Hades with his soul. And Peter says, “because he was not able to be ruled by it,”⁴ that is, by Hades.⁵ (3) And the Savior himself says: “I have authority to take up my soul and to lay it down,”⁶ and, “I am the good shepherd, the one who lays down his soul for his sheep”;⁷ and, “My soul is troubled,” he says; “What should I say?” (as in doubt he was saying, “What should I say?”): “‘Father, save me from this hour’? But because of this I came to this hour,”⁸ (4) in order that he might show that his divinity had come to this willingly. He says the phrase “is troubled,”⁹ in order that the form of the truth of his incarnate *parousia* might not <be falsified>. (5) For the incarnate *parousia* was not in appearance, but in the manner of a great king waging war against one more inferior, who knows that his enemy, if he should see him coming in power and with great strength, will beg off and will turn to flight and will destroy many lands of his [the king’s] subjects. And because of this, in his wisdom he feigns excuses and turns his back and flees, until the enemy taking up courage might be persuaded that the king is cowardly and powerless and might pursue him. And the king, turning himself around suddenly, behind the entire body of men of his force, awaits the weak and opposing [force]. (6) And thus our Lord did not fear death, the one who, before he came for suffering, indicated in his journey that the Son of Man was going to be given over and to be crucified and to rise on the third day. And with Peter saying, “Propitiously for you Lord, this shall not be for you,” he rebuked him, saying, “Get behind me, Satan,” “because you do not think the things of God, but the things of man.”¹⁰ (7) So the one who foretells these things and who, for the sake of this, comes to it, in what way does he later pray that the cup might bypass him: in order that he might not drink?¹¹ The one who spoke concerning his

sense of Epiphanius’s usage as “*menschliche Wirklichkeit Jesu Christi, und zwar in Leib und Seele.*”

3. Ps 87.5.

6. Jn 10.18.

9. Ibid.

11. Cf. Mt 26.39; Mk 14.36; Lk 22.42.

4. Acts 2.24.

7. Jn 10.11, 10.15.

10. Mt 16.22–23.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 69.66.1–2.

8. Jn 12.27.

death before dying, for the sake of his not being suspected a liar, should not have been able to pray that the cup might bypass him. (8) But he challenges the opponent through such a sight,¹² in order that, because that one suspected that the Savior had feared death, he might bring forth death to himself through the economy for salvation for those who are dying.¹³ (9) But if you might have heard that the Lord has died, know how the passion of his death has been fulfilled. For the chief of the apostles, Peter, interprets for you the purpose of his death, saying, "put to death in flesh, but made alive in spirit."¹⁴ For his divinity, which experienced suffering in flesh, is impassible and was impassible and remained impassible, with an impassibility that has not been changed and with an eternity that has not been altered.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE

(1) And again the vainglorious might say: "Not from such statements are you able to persuade us that Christ possessed a soul. For we have found above in the divine Scriptures, as Isaiah says, [speaking] from the person¹ of God and the Father concerning the Only-begotten: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, whom my soul loved.'"² (2) What will we think concerning the Father, that he has assumed a soul in himself or that he possesses a soul? But who, being a fool, will think this concerning the Father? So what do they say? "Clearly the statement was spoken more figuratively." (3) Therefore, if they say what was said concerning the Father was more figurative, then it is also necessary to understand the same thing concerning the Son. For if he says that "My soul is troubled,"³ and "<I have the authority> to lay down my soul and to take it up,"⁴ then he was not possessing, they say, a soul, but what was said was more figurative.⁵ (4) And it seems that their syllogistic thought says

12. "sight" = προσώπου.

13. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.57.

14. 1 Pt 3.18.

1. "person" = προσώπου.

2. Is 42.1.

3. Jn 12.27.

4. Jn 10.18.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 69.50.1-9, on how a more figurative reading of the Father's "soul" did not necessitate the same for the Son.

something, <but they did not persuade us> because the truth is self-supporting from many proofs. For each way [of speaking] is understood from the [literary] form. For about the Father one must not dare [to say this], since he did not bear flesh. With the flesh being confessed by the Lucianists or Arians, there is no doubt. (5) But, he [the heretic] says: "The *Logos* became flesh,"⁶ and it did not say, 'The *Logos* became flesh and soul.'" Against their contradiction, which is stupid, I say that "God formed man, taking dust from the earth,"⁷ but from "he formed," it [the Scripture] has included all things. And from "The *Logos* became flesh,"⁸ it encompasses all things. (6) For against the same argument we reply to them, and we say: Behold, it says, "God formed man,"⁹ and it did not say: "He made in him a liver or lungs or heart or veins or tendons or whatever other things are in the body." From this will we think a man to be any one solid thing, because the Scripture did not specify precisely the synthesis of the whole living being? Not at all. As at any rate from the one [literary] form it has included all things, thus also it is very clear from the "flesh" that the Savior has also assumed the soul.¹⁰

CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

(1) Therefore, if he has assumed soul and body, just as has been shown, then the divinity was not made less than the *ousia* of the Father, being encompassed in [human] passions, in such a manner that he might thirst and might grow weary and might hunger and [might experience] as many human needs as there are. (2) And the fact that <God>, "does not grow weary nor is there a searching of his thought,"¹ but the Savior is found to have grown weary, does not mean that the *Logos*, who came down from on high, is not from the *ousia* of the Father. For he has not grown weary up above, but in the flesh. For it was necessary that the flesh grow weary, in order that it might not be believed [to be] in appearance, but in truth: (3) and however

6. Jn 1.14.

7. Gn 2.7.

8. Jn 1.14.

9. Gn 2.7.

10. Cf. *Pan.* 69.50.1-51.7.

1. Is 40.28.

much other things have such a [natural] force, to doze, to fall asleep, they are significant things of a man and subject to [human] contact.² For he assumed these things and was found a man. (4) "We found," for <it says>, "Messiah, about whom Moses wrote."³ But the ones who found him <did not find him?> through his incomprehensible nature, <but through his comprehensible?>, that is the incarnate [nature]. For since he was not being found according to his incomprehensibility, because of this it was comprehended by scribes: and "he gave his back to the whips and did not turn away his face from the disgrace of those spitting";⁴ "he wept,"⁵ and whatever other things about him are celebrated.⁶ (5) Who was able to whip the God-*Logos* in heaven or to strike or to spit on such an ineffable and incomprehensible one? And if the impassible *Logos* of God has suffered these things, then the passion is corporeal, external to his impassibility and again not external on account of his consenting to do so. And yet, at any rate, with him not suffering, the passion has been reckoned to him. (6) And just as on a cloak a stain does not reach the body of the one who bears it, but the stain of the cloak is reckoned to be on the one who bears it, thus God has suffered in the flesh, with his divinity suffering nothing. And the suffering of the flesh was reckoned to the divinity, by the divinity who bears it, in order that in the divinity salvation might come to be for us.⁷

2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.17.3, 69.48.2-4.

3. *Jn* 1.45.

4. *Is* 50.6.

5. *Lk* 19.41.

6. This particular section (because of its vocabulary) is an important point of dispute and discussion in the question of whether or not Epiphanius was a fourth-century iconoclast. See S. Bigham, *Epiphanius of Salamis, Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth*, Patristic Theological Library 3 (Rollinsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008), especially 87-89.

7. Cf. *Anc.* 93.5-6; *Pan.* 77.33.1-2. This analogy was also not unlike the point made by Ath., *Ar.* 3.32. Like Athanasius, Epiphanius here was trying to maintain that paradox of a divine, impassible *Logos* who assumed a human body and truly suffered. Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 215-31, demonstrates how Athanasius was able to preserve this difficult logic through a "partitive exegesis, where what is said of Christ as divine is taken to refer to who he is, and what is said of him as human refers to what he has done" (222). See also the analysis in Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 141-63.

CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN

(1) I have been reminded of the saying of the Gospel of Luke, and I do not wish to allow it to be uninterpreted, what has been written that, "having come to be in agony he sweated, and his sweat became for him as drops of blood, and an angel of the Lord appeared, strengthening him."¹ (2) [With respect to] the deeper things and the necessary things of the words (as we have been accustomed to speak on), those who do not think about the meaning turn themselves against the good over to evil. For nothing is more important than this. (3) For the saying "having come to be in agony"² shows that the Lord's-man was a true man. And in order that he might demonstrate that he was a true man and that the agony has not come to be from the divinity, it says, "he sweated, and his sweat became for him as drops of blood."³ The form is physical and not spiritual. (4) "An angel of the Lord appeared strengthening him,"⁴ does not mean that the one greater than angels was in need of the strength of an angel, [the one] "to whom every knee bends, of the heavenly places and on the earth and under it,"⁵ to the *Logos* who is always God and is always with the Father and has been begotten from him. But it was in order that he might fulfill that which is in the great song of Moses sung in the desert, in which he was saying: "Let all the sons of God bow in worship to him, and let the angels of God strengthen him."⁶ (5) The [phrase], "let them strengthen him," does not mean that they are supplying strength to him, but since the praise was strong in them to glorify God, with angels directly above and spiritual living beings shouting and saying, "Yours is the power; yours is the might; yours is the strength,"⁷ in this they demonstrate the "bowing in worship" and the "strengthening," that is, to offer to him one's own might of strength, as even the angel was seen in front of the disciples bowing in worship to its master. (6) It [the angel] was not ignorant of the extravagance of his benevolent economy, and it marveled at such a work of gentleness as that

1. Lk 22.43-44. See also his discussion above in *Anc.* 31.4-8.

2. Lk 22.44.

3. Ibid.

4. Lk 22.43.

5. Phil 2.10.

6. Dt 32.43.

7. Cf. 1 Chr 29.11; Rv 5.12-13; 7.12.

which was wrought in him, the defeating of the Devil, the crushing of the sting of death,⁸ the triumphing over principalities and authorities,⁹ the breaking of sin.¹⁰ (7) And because of the extravagance of the astonishment in praise, the angel, bowing in worship, was saying: "Yours is the strength, master,¹¹ for you had strength over death (and over Hades and over the Devil), to crush its sting and cast it away from humanity."¹²

CHAPTER THIRTY-EIGHT

(1) And again if he said, "Where have you placed Lazarus?"¹ in a human way, and concerning the one hemorrhaging blood, "Who touched me?"² or, "Whom do you seek?"³ or, "Who do men say that I am, the Son of Man?"⁴ or, "The child was growing and becoming strong in spirit,"⁵ or, "He was advancing in age and in wisdom,"⁶ or, "before the child knows to call 'father' or 'mother,'"⁷ do you not see, from the underlying assumption itself, the prevalence of the knowledge that the statements were according to his flesh and humanity?⁸ (2) For as many things which come down in the Old Testament from the person of God and Father for the persuasion of men, which keep one from ignorance, but are not unknown to God, these things, the *Logos* who came has fulfilled, in order that he might fulfill what has been said: "My Father works until now, and I am working."⁹ (3) "Where have you placed Lazarus?"¹⁰ he asked, having come near to the place. But before coming to the place, not having heard it from someone, he was saying to his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep."¹¹ Therefore, was the one who stood at such a long journey's distance from the place, who

8. Cf. 1 Cor 15.55.

9. Cf. Col 2.15.

10. Cf. *Pan.* 69.61.1-3, for parallel arguments.

11. Cf. 1 Chr 29.11; Rv 5.12-13; 7.12.

12. Cf. *Pan.* 69.61.1-62.9.

1. Jn 11.34.

4. Mt 16.13.

7. Is 8.4.

8. Cf. *Anc.* 108.1-7; *Ath., Ar.* 3.26, 3.46.

9. Jn 5.17.

2. Mk 5.30; Lk 8.45.

5. Lk 2.40.

10. Jn 11.34.

3. Jn 18.4.

6. Lk 2.52.

11. Jn 11.11.

knew that Lazarus had died, arriving in the place, ignorant? (4) Certainly not. But he was wishing to show that he was doing all these things, since not yet was anyone believing him completely, in order that he might demonstrate the great benevolence of his care toward us.¹² (5) For it was needful for those women not to say, "It is the fourth day, already there is a smell,"¹³ nor to depart and to show [him], but to say: "You know all things and if you will, he will live." Wherefore he also wept for the hardness of men.¹⁴ Therefore, not being ignorant, he was asking, but trying [them], he tests and shows kindness. (6) And, "Who touched me?"¹⁵ he says, not because he did not know who touched him, but in order that he might not say that the miracle came to be through himself, but in order that she who heard [him], coming forward, might say that the grace came to be in her and, having confessed, might hear: "Your faith has saved you,"¹⁶ in order that she might persuade others also to believe, that they might be healed. (7) "Who," he said, "do they say that I am, the Son of Man?"¹⁷ as also in the Old [Testament] from the person of the Father, he says, "Adam, where are you?"¹⁸ He knew where he was: wherefore he also tests him, saying afterwards, "You ate from the tree."¹⁹ (8) And to Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?"²⁰ he also was asking, not being ignorant. For he says, "You are accursed on the earth, which opened to receive the blood of your brother from your hand. For behold, his blood cries out to me."²¹ Therefore, the one speaking was not ignorant because the blood cries out. But in order that he might give to him [Cain] an occasion to repent and explain, because of this he was asking.

CHAPTER THIRTY-NINE

(1) Again they [heretics] twist themselves into the contentiousness of their stupidity, and they say that these expressions in the Old Testament were of the Son himself. Straightaway their practice is put to shame. For the one who said to Moses,

12. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.37-38, 3.46.

13. Jn 11.39.

16. Mk 5.34; Lk 8.48.

19. Gn 3.11.

14. Cf. Jn 11.35.

17. Mt 16.13.

20. Gn 4.9.

15. Mk 5.30; Lk 8.45.

18. Gn 3.9.

21. Gn 4.10-11.

"What is this in your hand?"¹ was himself saying, "I am who I am."² (2) And the Lord says to the Sadducees concerning the resurrection explaining, "that the dead are raised, God said: 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.' So God is of the living and not of the dead."³ (3) And again there are many things in the Old Testament to show that what has been said in it is from the person of the Father. But they are also often from the person of the Son and again from the person of the Holy Spirit.⁴ (4) And, "Where is Sarah, your wife?"⁵ the Son of God, who came from above with two angels, was saying to Abraham. For if he was ignorant of where she was, he would not have said "Sarah." (5) [The phrase] "so Sarah laughed, being inside the house"⁶ intends to show her modesty as a model for those who wish to be pious in truth, in order that when they receive strangers they may serve from their own labors on the one hand, but on the other hand because of modesty they may not show their face to men. (6) For that blessed woman fully prepared [herself] and, having prepared, was not appearing to the face of the angels, putting forth a model of modesty to subsequent generations. But also in order that the one who was present might show who he was, the one who was received as a guest at that time was calling <the> name of the woman, because neither the name itself nor the bodily form nor the thought of a man escaped his notice.⁷ (7) "Who," he says, "do men say that I am, the Son of Man?"⁸ and he himself,

1. Ex 4.2.

2. Ex 3.14.

3. Mk 12.26-27; Lk 20.37-38.

4. The phrase "from the person" here is *ἐκ προσώπου*. Cf. Lampe, 1186-89, for the many meanings and uses of this term. The language of *πρόσωπον* is significant, especially if the term as applied to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit means a distinct "person," as in the theology of Apollinarius. Basil, *ep.* 236.6, however, subordinated *prosopon* to *hypostasis* for concerns over Sabellianism. There were several early formulations which ultimately shaped Basil's formula; cf. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 202-4. One related issue in *Anc.* 8 is the unique contribution of Epiphanius's use of the term *mononym*, and not *hypostasis*, to distinguish the three persons of the Godhead, thus preserving a one-*hypostasis* theology. Throughout the *Anc.*, Epiphanius used the term *prosopon* to mean either a physical "face" or an individual "person," though he did not equate it with *hypostasis*.

5. Gn 18.9.

6. Gn 18.12.

7. Cf. *Anc.* 109.2-6.

8. Mt 16.13.

confessing, declares the Son of Man, in order that they might not believe that he asks concerning someone invisible. And they say, "Elijah," and "Jeremiah," and "John."⁹ "Who do you say that I am?"¹⁰ "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God,"¹¹ he [Peter] says, and at once he is blessed. (8) For not being ignorant was he asking, but wishing to show that the teaching is of the Father, that which declares to the church the true Son, in order that Peter might be compelled to say what he learned from the Father.

CHAPTER FORTY

(1) And you ought not marvel if he said that "through me they come to the Father,"¹ and you ought not suppose him to have been altered from the *ousia* of the Father. For again he himself teaches, "No one comes to me, unless the Father draws him."² As, at any rate, the Father sends to the Son, even the Son carries in to the Father, in order that he might show that they are one and the same divinity. (2) And [the phrase], "He was advancing in age and in wisdom,"³ if wisdom is of God, he does not lack wisdom. But although he emptied himself, assuming the form of a slave, the fullness was not altered;⁴ but [he did this] in order that he might show that he was being emptied from heaven into humanity, that is, into the womb of Mary. (3) "For perfume emptied out is your name,"⁵ it says. It did not say "poured forth," but "emptied out" from heaven to earth, in order that from earth to Mary <he might be emptied out>.⁶ And having become flesh from Mary, he is conceived, born in Bethlehem, from Bethlehem passes over into Nazareth, from Nazareth into Capernaum, from Capernaum into Jerusalem and the sea in which he walked upon the water, and parts of Tyre and Nain and Judaea and Jericho and into Bethpage and Bethany, and into Jerusalem

9. Mt 16.14.

10. Mt 16.15.

11. Mt 16.16.

1. Cf. Jn 14.6.

2. Jn 6.44.

3. Lk 2.52.

4. Cf. Phil 2.7.

5. Song 1.3.

6. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 211, n. 444, for a note on Epiphanius's emphasis on the difference in meaning here, probably due to his desire to eliminate any possibility of understanding Christ as an emanation or a gradation. The *kenosis* must be absolute and complete in the Incarnation.

and the Temple and the Mount of Olives and Gethsemane, into the house of Caiaphas to the *praetorium* and to Herod, to the place Golgotha into the tomb, and even as far as Hades, into the earth and after the resurrection, into heaven. (4) For perfume emptied out from vessels into a vessel anoints all the vessels; and the *parousia* of Christ from heaven sanctified the whole earth, those who receive him in truth.⁷ (5) He who is the mountain, as in Daniel <it says>, and a great mountain, “a stone being cut without hands,”⁸ alluding to one <who was begotten?> without the seed of a man, the greater one in turn is found small: a stone again taking up magnitude and becoming again a great mountain, and <it is clear> that <the> mountain is not in one place, but filling up the entire inhabited world. (6) This is the one who is wisdom and became a man, extending his power to the universe. In order that he might fill the inhabited world with grace, “he was advancing in age and in wisdom.”⁹ (7) Since he is the one who is wisdom of the Father and “teaches men”¹⁰ to speak, and who invented speech for men, and “who planted the ear”¹¹ for those who listen, how did he not know to call “father” and “mother”?¹² <About whom it adds that?> “he will take the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria,”¹³ and what follows? (8) But since, having been born from a womb, if he was showing himself speaking at once and clearly was uttering such things indeed as a growing boy, he would be believed an illusion and not true, or rather, his incarnate conception [would be believed only] in appearance. Because of this consequently he abides a little of his youth, in order that might not obscure the veracity of the ordering [of life].

7. Cf. Did., *spir.* 51–53, which applies the same image first to the incarnate Christ, then to the Holy Spirit. Contrast the perfume imagery employed by Eus., *d.e.* 5.1 (215a–216c), in which Eusebius tried to explain how the Son is generated from the Father.

8. Dn 2.34.

9. Lk 2.52. Cf. *Pan.* 77.26.1–7, for a parallel explanation of Lk 2.52. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 3.51–53.

10. Ps 93.10.

11. Ps 93.9.

12. Is 8.4.

13. Ibid.

CHAPTER FORTY-ONE

(1) Again they strive after other vain notions, mixing them with the divine words and thinking contrarily, and they say: so how has it been written, "accept that the high priest of our confession was faithful to the one who made him,"¹ and "let it be known to you, all the house of Israel, that this Jesus, whom you crucified, God made him Lord and Christ"?² (2) And a great wonder comes upon me, how those who possess the orderings [of Scripture] are ignorant of the meaning being declared in them. For the saying, "Accept that the high priest was faithful to the one who made him,"³ has not been said concerning the divinity. (3) For God came, and in all things the divine Scriptures explain to us. For nothing in them is obscure or complicated; "all things are open to those who understand and right to those who find knowledge."⁴ (4) For it says, "Receive instruction and not silver."⁵ For if someone did not receive instruction from God, that is the faith of the truth, all things have been obscure and twisted for him. But to those who understand rightly and find knowledge, all things are right and blameless. (5) But in order that he might put them to shame, the Apostle says, "for every high priest taken from among men is appointed on behalf of men, to offer gifts and sacrifices."⁶ (6) Because of this also the Only-begotten himself, since on behalf of men he came to become a high priest, assumed from us the flesh, in order that on our behalf, the one who came to be from us, as an offering to his own Father God, "might call brothers"⁷ his disciples. So where is "came to be" fulfilled? Not from another place, but from the high priest. For <it says>, "Accept that the high priest was faithful to the one who made him."⁸ (7) In order that I might make use of a more remarkable illustration: who would ask a king concerning his own son, daring even to say to him, "Who is this?" And having heard from the father the correct acknowledgment:

1. Heb 3.1-2.

2. Acts 4.10. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1.53, 2.2-11.

3. Heb 3.1-2.

4. *Prv* 8.9.

5. *Prv* 8.10.

6. Heb 5.1.

7. Heb 2.11.

8. Heb 3.1-2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.37.1-38.4.

"He is my son," again would he question, "Is he your natural son?" And with the king answering "Yes," will the one asking add again: "So what did you make him?" He [the king] will surely say, "I made him king." (8) Then did the one who speaks deny the worthy legitimate birth? If he said the latter, did he do away with the former? Not at all! Thus at any rate also God and Father begot the Son without beginning, and in the flesh has been fulfilled the [phrase], "He made him high priest."⁹

CHAPTER FORTY-TWO

(1) But, they say, it has been written: "The Lord created me, the beginning of his ways for his works."¹ And in the first place the vainglorious are ignorant of the name of the book. For the book is called "Proverbs of Solomon." But all that is spoken as a proverb is not the same as it is in the meaning of the word.²

9. Heb 3.1-2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.39.1-5.

1. Prv 8.22. Cf. *Pan.* 69.12.1-4, 69.14.1-3, 69.20.1-21.6, for parallel explanations of the verse; and 73.29.1-33.5, which was a reproduction of a sermon by Meletius on this passage. See Morales, *La théologie*, 96-104, for exegesis of this verse by Arius, Marcellus of Ancyra, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Athanasius; and Spoerl, "The Schism," 101-26, and Karmann, *Meletius*, 75-134, for Meletius. For non-Nicenes, this verse was a scriptural affirmation that the Son was created; cf. Eus., *d.e.* 5.1.8-9; Eusebius of Nicomedia, *epistula ad Paulinum Tyrium* Also, *Ath.*, *decr.* 13-14; *epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* 17; *ep. Serap.* 1.3.3-5, 2.7.1-4 but especially *Ar.* 2.44-82, with an extensive theological and exegetical discussion of Prv 8.22-27. Athanasius understood "created" as a specific reference to when Christ was "created" as a man, in the economy of salvation. See Morales, *La théologie*, 414-19, on how Athanasius distinguished in his Christology the properties that were attributable to Christ's humanity and those that were appropriate only for his divinity. Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 209-10, discusses Athanasius's exegesis of this text via his "partitive reading" of Scripture. Conversely, Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 138, discusses how the imagery drawn from this text was particularly useful for Arius, who understood the text to refer univocally to Christ, that is, in a manner that does not distinguish the divine or the human Son.

DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea," demonstrates how Basil, *Eun.* 2.20, explained this verse against the Heteroousian interpretation that this affirmed the Son as a creature. Furthermore, Basil's understanding was influenced not by Athanasius but Eusebius of Caesarea, who explained this verse in opposition to Marcellus, who "had argued that that text was a prophetic reference to the 'creation' of the incarnate Christ, not the pre-existent Word" (186).

2. Cf. *Ath.*, *Ar.* 2.44. Bas., *Eun.* 2.20: "Second, in this book a great deal of

(2) For behold our Lord Jesus Christ spoke in parables, and we should not perceive the parables thus as being according to our purpose. (3) "For like," it says, "a mustard seed is the kingdom of heaven."³ And if according to our mind we might wish to think about it in part, it is clear that the kingdom of heaven is a place of open space. (4) Then if it is necessary to say "a place," in which kingdom there is a king, God and Father and God-Logos, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit of God, both angels and archangels, a spiritual host, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the just, how therefore will so many things be contained in a mustard seed? The figurative sense of the word is spoken mysteriously. Then that which is spoken as a proverb is not the same [in meaning]. (5) But [the same is true] also for the woman who had ten drachmae, and lost one, and lit a lamp, and found it,⁴ but also for the net cast into the sea,⁵ but also for the seed being sown in the earth.⁶ All these things <were spoken> mysteriously, and are not the same in meaning. (6) And really we do not know Solomon the author of Proverbs, if he has said this word concerning the Son of God. (7) For there is [one] wisdom and [another] wisdom. So the Apostle knew to say: "for the world did not know God, through the wisdom of God,"⁷ and "God made foolish the wisdom of the world."⁸ And again he says, "not in fleshly wisdom, but in the power of God."⁹ And Solomon knew how to call wisdom, saying, "I loved her beauty and took her as a bride for myself,"¹⁰ and Job knew wisdom and says, "Where was wisdom found? And what is the place of understanding?"¹¹ And "Wisdom of the poor man is scorned";¹² and "He is the corrector of wisdom,"¹³ and "The Only-begotten is the wisdom of the Father."¹⁴

the meaning is hidden and on the whole it proceeds by means of proverbs, parables, dark sayings, and enigmas, such that no one may take anything from it that is either indisputable or crystal-clear" (trans. by DeCogliano and Radde-Gallwitz, *Against Eunomius*, FOTC 122, 160).

3. Mt 13.31.

6. Cf. Mt 13.24.

9. 1 Cor 2.5.

12. Eccl 9.16.

4. Cf. Lk 15.8.

7. 1 Cor 1.21.

10. Wis 8.2.

13. Wis 7.15.

5. Cf. Mt 13.47.

8. 1 Cor 1.20.

11. Jb 28.12.

14. Cf. 1 Cor 1.30.

CHAPTER FORTY-THREE

(1) So what do we say? If Father is wisdom, and the Son, according to their mind, did not come forth from him (the *Logos*, who is both God and wisdom), then the Father is lacking wisdom in himself.¹ (2) So how is "God alone, wise, invisible"² [and] all these things incomprehensible and infinite to men? God gave wisdom to Solomon³ and filled Bezalel with wisdom,⁴ and, "Wise men conceal shame."⁵ (3) And concerning wisdom there are many things to say. That wisdom of the Father is unique, not having another comparison.⁶ (4) Nevertheless, if also concerning it [wisdom] the Word is acclaimed, I neither add nor exclude, but I defer to God for knowing: I am compelled to see that the things which have been said are opposed. "He created [me]," for it says, "the beginning of his ways for his works; before the age he established me; before all the mountains he begets me."⁷ (5) So how is that which is begotten being established? How is that which is created begotten? For if created, verily not begotten. (6) For what we beget we do not create, and what we create we do not beget: for we are created, and the things which are begotten by us are created.⁸ (7) But in the uncreated God that which is begotten is not created. For if he begot, he did not create. And if, after creating, again he has begotten, how then is that which was first created later begotten?⁹ (8) Therefore, if what is being said is concerning him, it is fulfilled in the incarnate economy.¹⁰ And because of this it says first the more recent things and describes the older things

1. Ath., *Ar.* 2.37-40, accused both Arius and Asterius of teaching that the Father's proper word and wisdom (and power) were other than the Son, who was a different, created Word and Wisdom; cf. Ath., *decr.* 15.1-17.9; *Dion.* 23-25; *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12-15; *syn.* 18.2-7.

2. 1 Tm 1.17.

3. Cf. 1 Kgs 3.3-14.

4. Cf. Ex 31.3.

5. Prv 10.14.

6. Cf. *Pan.* 69.20.1-9.

7. Cf. Prv 8.22-25.

8. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 2.4, 2.60; *ep. Serap.* 2.6.1-5, on the differences between "creating," "making," and "begetting."

9. Cf. *Pan.* 69.26.3-6, in which Epiphanius made a parallel discussion on the begetting of the Son, but with an emphasis on preserving the belief in God's immutability and impassibility. Cf. Bas., *Eun.* 2.6-8.

10. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 2.11, 2.45, 2.74-75.

later.¹¹ (9) For wishing to persuade the most recent men, it begins from the flesh (for the beginning of the ways of righteousness of the Gospel is that the *Logos* became flesh for us in Mary, and his soul has been established in her flesh), in order that it might show the higher things later. (10) And we say that out of the Fatherly bosom from the heavens he came to be on the earth, since he came to us later, having completed the entire economy. So then the *Logos* is not created ("by no means!"),¹² and the divine Scripture did not generate anything obscure for us, in absolutely nothing.¹³

CHAPTER FORTY-FOUR

(1) But both by nature and by translators the phrase has not been rendered thus in this way. For Aquila says, "The Lord acquired me,"¹ although in the Hebrew it says, *Adonai kanani*: this very thing is translated as we have said. And according to custom, we say about those who beget, "He acquired children." (2) But thus he [Aquila] did not preserve the meaning of the translation. For *Adonai kanani* also is thus able to be translated "The Lord hatched me."² And because of this Peter declared wisely, saying, "This is Jesus, whom you crucified."³ He did not say, "God-*Logos* from on high," but "This is Jesus," <that is>, the flesh which has been brought together with the *Logos* from on high in the womb of Mary, and "this" is said⁴ on account of the Lord's-man from Mary.⁵ (3) For in this also, that which <is put

11. Cf. *Pan.* 69.22.1.

12. *Rom* 6.2.

13. Cf. *Pan.* 69.23.6.

1. *Prv* 8.22. Instead of ἐκτίσέ με, "he created me," the phrase here is ἐκτήσατό με, "he acquired me." DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea," 187-89, shows how the explanation of the variant translation was originally offered by Eusebius. See also Morales, *La théologie*, 100-101. Cf. *Bas.*, *Eun.* 2.20.

2. "hatched me" = ἐνόσσευσέ με.

3. *Acts* 2.36. Cf. *Pan.* 69.25.1-26.2.

4. Using the variant reading λεγόμενον (instead of λεγομένην), suggested in the critical apparatus of Holl's edition, p. 54.

5. Cf. *Ath.*, *Ar.* 2.12; *Bas.*, *Eun.* 2.20. Basil had completed this treatise in 364 or 365; cf. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 8, n. 1. Also see Ayres, *Nicaea*, 191-209.

to death?> is fulfilled, as Peter says, "put to death in flesh, but made alive in spirit,"⁶ and again "so with Christ suffering in the flesh on our behalf."⁷ And again, "from whom Christ, according to the flesh,"⁸ as Paul says. (4) And the Savior himself was saying in the Gospel, "and now you seek to kill me, a man who has spoken the truth to you, which I heard from the Father,"⁹ in order that he might show the passion from his humanity and more inferior parts, but that he is the natural¹⁰ son of the Father from on high. (5) And the holy Apostle Paul celebrates with this word, saying, "there is one God, and there is one mediator of God and men, a man Jesus Christ,"¹¹ "who did not regard to be equal to God something to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave."¹² (6) You see that he showed himself a man, but not a mere [man]. For [it says] "mediator of God and men,"¹³ since he mediates between both. To his Father, he is genuine God, by nature, having been begotten, but to men he is a genuine man, natural,¹⁴ having been begotten from Mary without the seed of a man. For thus he is the mediator of God and of men, being God and having become a man, not having changed his nature, but according to each, mediating for both.¹⁵

CHAPTER FORTY-FIVE

(1) But again those who are ignorant also say: "You see that, 'he did not regard to be equal to God something to be grasped.'"¹ And the contentious ones do not know the appellation. For it did not say: "He did not wish to become equal to God through something to be grasped," but, "He did not regard to be equal to God something to be grasped,"² [that is,] to be God by nature, because he was. (2) For if he was not, how did he assume the form of a slave?³ And he [Paul] indicated a recent

6. 1 Pt 3.18.

9. Jn 8.40.

12. Phil 2.6-7.

15. Cf. *Anc.* 66.1.

7. 1 Pt 4.1.

10. "natural" = φυσικόν.

13. 1 Tm 2.5.

8. Rom 9.5.

11. 1 Tm 2.5.

14. Again, φυσικός.

1. Phil 2.6.

2. Ibid.

3. Cf. Phil 2.7. Cf. *Anc.* 28.6.

thing, and from this he, marveling, was showing the abundance [of God], because although he [the Son] was equal to God he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, not in order that he might enslave freedom, but <in order that> in the form that he assumed he might free those slaves who heed [him].⁴ (3) And as the Jews bear witness that he was not ashamed to say that he was equal to God nor was he doubting, but that from the showing, he was thus more confident in the saying, “If I do not speak, I will be a liar like you.”⁵ And because of this, they say to him, “Not because of a good work will we kill you, but because, being a man, you make yourself equal to God.”⁶ (4) But they [heretics] say: “We are obliged to confess the figurative things <concerning> him [Christ]. And Scripture has said many figurative things about him, and it is not necessary to deny things which have been said mysteriously in regard to him, because even he has been called a door and has been said to be a stone, and a pillar, cloud, lion, sheep, lamp, torch, sun, angel, worm, rock, cornerstone, path, bull, calf, and such things.” (5) Clearly we do not deny the things which have been fulfilled mysteriously in him. And we know on account of what cause these things have been written: “path,” because we walk through him toward the kingdom, to him and the Father; “door,” because we enter through him; “pillar,” because he is the foundation of our faith; “rock,” on account of his immovability; “stone,” <because of> that which has been laid down as a foundation; “sun,” of righteousness because he illuminated our darkened thinking.⁷

CHAPTER FORTY-SIX

(1) Next they [heretics] say that “<If> it has been written concerning him that he is a creature, it is necessary to confess also that he is a creature.”¹ Behold, I described a certain part of

4. Cf. *Pan.* 69.16.4.

5. *Jn* 8.55.

6. *Jn* 10.33.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 69.34.5–35.5; *Bas.*, *Eun.* 1.7, *Spir.* 8.17; *Cyr. H.*, *catech.* 10.3–5, on the various images of Christ that a catechumen ought to know. Basil’s discussion in *Eun.* 1.7 emphasized that these different designations of Christ were conceptualizations referring to Christ but did not reveal his substance. See DelCogliano, *Theory of Names*, 142, 169–70. For “sun of righteousness” see *Mal* 4.2.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 69.34.3–5.

the sayings, which have been fulfilled for us through the mysteries concerning him. Let them say to us what is useful in saying, "He is a creature"? (2) Reasonably he has been said figuratively a "door," in order that he might become our entrance and aid, and "path," in order that, walking through him, we might not be led astray. On account of what does he become a "creature" for us? As what does he help us?² (3) "Yes," the vainglorious one says, being contentious: "for if you would not say that he is a creature, you would attribute passion to the Father."³ For all who beget have been encompassed with passion: for either one is contracted or widened or spread out or decays or is raised up or any such thing."⁴ (4) Alas for such thinking, which is wicked and not at all true! Who will think such things concerning God? What sort of opinion will dare such things? Clearly no one, not [even] of demons, will think such a thing. (5) And if someone confesses the Father, he believes that he has begotten the Son in truth. For the divinity is not carried about in measurable quantities, nor is it a pregnant body, in order that it might admit of what has been said before.⁵ (6) "For God is spirit,"⁶ and spirit does not submit to flux, nor cutting, nor contraction, nor lessening, nor simplification, nor any such thing. Therefore, in so far as the Father is spirit, he has begotten the Son, God-*Logos*, spiritually, timelessly, incomprehensibly, and without beginning.⁷

CHAPTER FORTY-SEVEN

(1) In order that we might persuade those who think these things, on the one hand [we are] not saying the same things, on the other hand, turning away their wicked defense from the same things, let us say: a creature is immeasurably and infinitely inferior to its master.¹ (2) And many in the desert who lack fire,

2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.35.1, 69.36.1.

3. "passion" = *πάθος*.

4. Cf. *Pan.* 69.36.4, where Epiphanius attributed such a sentiment to Arius.

5. Cf. *Anc.* 5.8, 17.5; *Ath., Ar.* 1.15, 1.16, 1.28.

6. *Jn* 4.24.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 69.15.4, 69.36.6, 69.53.8, 70.5.2, for parallel uses of *Jn* 4.24; also see 76.6.1-11, on the Heteroousian view. Cf. *Gr. Naz., or.* 29.4.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 69.18.5. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 222-27, sees *Anc.* 47.1-48.5 as a break in the flow of the preceding argument.

having filled liquid in a glass vessel and having added a flammable material made out of flax or hemp, set it up against the gleaming of the sun. From the glass shining upon the material substrate and straightaway from the heat of the sun it takes and kindles fire. Then has the sun been divided through the participation of its *ousia*?² Then did it lack? Then has it been diminished? “No,” they say. (3) Therefore, if, being a created thing, it [the sun] was not diminished, by how much more at any rate is the one who is God infinite and incomprehensible and undefiled? Being spirit,³ having begot from himself, he begot the God-*Logos*, ineffable and incomprehensible and incorruptible in incorruption, not through passion, nor through division, nor through loss. But the perfect one [begot] a perfect one, in perfection.⁴ (4) And the nature of fire kindles many lamps from one [flame], and the one which was first was not diminished. Again, the same *ousia* is able to be out of many divisions, and I speak of lamps or torches.⁵ (5) But not thus is the divinity, “by no means!”⁶ For again, the *Logos* did not enter <into>, and was not made a coalescence with, the Father, but the Father is the Father, and the Son the Son, and the Holy Spirit the Holy Spirit.⁷

CHAPTER FORTY-EIGHT

(1) For foolish is that which has been said by the Manichaeans, that in the mind of Mani, souls, which came to be from a

2. Earlier examples of the sun-sunlight image are found in Justin Martyr, *dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo* 128; Athenagoras, *supplicatio pro Christianis* 10.4; Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 21.12; Hippolytus, *contra haeresin Noëti* 11; Ath., *Ar.* 2.33. Eus., *d.e.* 4.3 (147a–149b), also utilizes a sun-ray image, but in a way that reflects a “particular version of Origen’s subordinationist account of the relation of the Son to the Father . . .” See R. Hanson, “Transformation of Images in Trinitarian Theology,” *StPatr* 17.1 (1982), 100. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 233–34, also discusses how Ephrem deployed the analogy.

3. Cf. Jn 4.24.

4. Cf. *Pan.* 69.15.3; Ath., *Ar.* 2.33–34; *ep. Serap.* 1.16.5, on the indivisibility of God. Also see Eus., *d.e.* 5.1 (213b–214b) on the indivisibility of God, which led him to hesitate to describe precisely how the Father begot the Son.

5. Cf. Gr. Naz., *or.* 30.6, on the torch-fire imagery and comparison.

6. Rom 6.2.

7. Epiphanius was trying here to refute any materialist understandings of the begetting of the Son.

pillar of light, are one body; and being loosed from their bodies are molded again in one *ousia*, as in the one pillar, according to the myth of their invention.¹ (2) But thus the Gospel did not point this out, but he broke off from five loaves and fed five thousand and did not get rid of the leftovers of them. But, "Collect together," he says, "and leave behind none of the fragments,"² and they collected together twelve baskets. (3) And they gathered together into containers, and he did not make the fragments again into a rejoining of loaves, as they were. They gathered together the [entire] quantity [of bread], but in many fragments. But it [the Gospel] pointed out one collection of baskets. (4) And we did not allegorize this in accordance with a subject of speculation and the analogy of the sun spoken about earlier. For we do not say that the loaves are souls, nor the fragments, "by no means!"³ nor do we equate God with the sun created by him, nor the Only-begotten with the light being sent by the sun onto the hempen wick.⁴ (5) Likewise also, souls which were produced are not joined together into one coalescence, "by no means!"⁵ but into the dwelling-places of God which have been written about, that "there are many dwelling-places at my Father's house."⁶ They do not come to be in one heap, but with each being accounted separately. (6) Nor in saying that God has begotten his only-begotten Son do we attribute passion to him, according to the wicked blasphemy of those people. "For all who beget toil passionately, and one must not say either creature or something begotten," according to their argument, "in order that we might not assign to God toiling or suffering."⁷ So wherefore did we find the Son, or because of what does he have the name "Son"? (7) These are syllogisms

1. Cf. *Pan.* 66.26.1-8, for the Manichaean teaching on souls.

2. *Jn* 6.12.

3. *Rom* 6.2.

4. Cf. *Gr. Naz.*, *or.* 31.32.2-6, who repudiated the sun allegory; but in contrast, *Ath.*, *Ar.* 3.15. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 224-26, also discusses important early parallel parables in *Just.*, *dial.* 62, 128, and he argues that Epiphanius knew Justin's writing.

5. *Rom* 6.2.

6. *Jn* 14.2.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 69.36.5-6.

of men, and they originate from earthly thought. For it is unlawful to reckon the suffering of us men to God, since God says wisely, "as your thinking is not my thinking," and again "not as a man, thus even is God."⁸

CHAPTER FORTY-NINE

(1) Therefore, let them cease from blasphemy, and let them learn from the Father, who says, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."¹ Again, as in the presence of those who hesitate, he says, "for you are my beloved Son, whom I chose,"² and then in the Song of Songs, "having been chosen from the myriads."³ (2) So let them say from where the choice comes to be. For foolish ones believe that in the saying "whom I chose,"⁴ he is called "son" according to grace and not according to nature.⁵ Let them show who is like him, in order that he [the Father] who tested them all, might choose that one. (3) For if the Son is only-begotten, there is not someone who is equal or comparable to him: "Who is similar to the Son among the sons of God?"⁶ For one knows these according to grace, and [knows] that someone is not able to be made equal to that one [the Son], who is Son naturally. (4) For it is evident from where [the phrase] "having been chosen"⁷ and from where the choice are: because there were many myriads upon the earth, and Mary alone "found favor,"⁸ and in her he chose the holy flesh. (5) Because of this he was saying, "I am well pleased,"⁹ as David also says, from the person of the Apostles who have believed in the Lord and who indicate with joy to the nations his grace, because "he subjected the peoples for us and nations under our feet, <he chose for us his inheritance>, the beauty of Jacob, which he loved,"¹⁰ (6) that is, the purity of his beauty, the beauty of all of

8. Is 55.8; 1 Sm 15.29. Cf. *Pan.* 69.36.1-6, for a parallel argument.

1. Mt 3.17. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 231-33, sees here, from 49.1-50.3, another interruption in the flow of the argument from *Anc.* 48.6.

2. Is 44.1.

3. Song 5.10.

4. Is 44.1.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 69.18.1-3; Ath., *Ar.* 1.5-6.

6. Ps 88.7.

7. Song 5.10.

8. Lk 1.30.

9. Mt 3.17.

10. Ps 46.4-5.

Jacob, the flesh that was chosen from Mary through the Holy Spirit. The Father on high pointed out the coming to be of the economy of the flesh to John the Baptist. For the Father was well pleased in the incarnate *parousia* of Christ, but the divinity of his nature holds fast infinitely.

CHAPTER FIFTY

(1) The Apostle [Paul] also says that he is "Son of love," "who drew us," he says, "from the authority of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his Son of love."¹ (2) And the foolish ones here, not thinking about the phrase, say that he is the Son according to a progression of the love of God. And the stupid ones do not know the correspondence of the word. For in another place the Apostle [John] says that "God loved us in Christ."² (3) For truly the Only-begotten is the beloved Son. Since the Father is love, the Son is love, since love is from love. So he is the Son of love for our sake and through himself, because in him he [the Father] loved us and gave his only-begotten Son for us. So neither does he toil while working, nor does he suffer while begetting. (4) And may they not heap up for themselves the folly of blasphemy. For if the Son is created, he is not to be worshiped according to their argument. For it is a foolish thing to worship a creation and to disregard the first commandment, which says, "Hear, Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord."³ (5) Therefore, the holy *Logos* is not created, because he is worshiped. The disciples worshiped him; the angels in heaven worship him: "and let all the angels of God worship him,"⁴ and, "I will worship you, O Lord, my strength."⁵ (6) One thing is specific and concise and irrefutable, which no one is able to dispute: if those who are enemies to the Son of God have testimony to show, where the Father said that "I cre-

1. Col 1.13.

2. Cf. 1 Jn 4.10.

3. Dt 6.4. In *Anc.* 70, Epiphanius established a parallel argument for the Holy Spirit as worthy of worship. Cf. *Pan.* 76.8.1-11, for a similar argument in refutation of Aetius.

4. Ps 96.7.

5. Cf. Ps 17.2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.31.4.

ated a Son for me" in the Old and New Testaments or where the Son said that "the Father created me." There are four Gospels of one thousand one hundred and sixty-two chapters, and from the beginning until the end, nowhere did the Son say and the Father say to him, "my Father created me," nor the Father: "I created a Son for me," or "I created my Son."⁶

CHAPTER FIFTY-ONE

(1) But the one who loves to quarrel and loves glory says: "So why do you say 'the body'?" Clearly it has been received from Mary. "But why Mary?" he says; "Is she uncreated or created?" Clearly she is created, and we [the orthodox] ourselves say, that she was begotten from a man and a woman. [The heretic says,] "So why do you say 'from Mary'? Do you worship the Savior in the body or do you not worship?" So how will I [the orthodox] not worship? For if I do not worship, I do not have life. [The heretic says], "So behold, you worship a created thing, the body." (2) There is much madness of those who say such things. For even a king having been clothed in purple is worshiped by all.¹ Then is the purple worshiped or the king? It is quite clear that it is the king. But is the purple being worn also worshiped together with him? But when the king takes this off and sets it in place, the purple garment is no longer worshiped. (3) And a king is oft seated on his own throne in the temple, and the worshipers worship the king in his temple and on the throne. But when the king has been roused [from his throne], no one worships either the temple or the throne. No insane person, who wishes to worship the king in his temple, says to the king: "Leave your temple, in order that I might worship you." (4) Thus at any rate no one would say to the Only-begotten, "Give up your body, in order that I might worship you," but one worships the

6. Cf. *Pan.* 64.8.5-9.1.

1. Epiphanius used the word *προσκυνέω* in this analogy of a king. Up to this point, I have translated the term as "worship," though in this particular section the meaning is probably better understood as "revere," "make obeisance," or "bow down before." Nevertheless, for the sake of consistency I have continued to translate the term as "worship."

Only-begotten with his body, <the> uncreated one with his holy "temple," which he assumed when he came.² (5) And no one says to the king: "Stand up from your throne, in order that I might worship you without the throne," but one worships the king with his throne. And at any rate, Christ also is worshiped with his body, which was buried and has been raised.

CHAPTER FIFTY-TWO

(1) "But," they say, "so what do you say? Did the Father beget the Son willingly or not willingly? Since <you> say, <the> *Logos* always was and there was not a time before the *Logos*?"¹ Indeed, even the Arians themselves according to their fraud assert that the Son of God has been begotten timelessly, but they do not wish to say that he is eternal, but say, "there was once when he was not." They believe "once" is not time.² (2) But when you examine the phrase, you put to shame the stupid ones. For the "once" said in words is indicative of time. And those who say that it does not mean time fall into a logical absurdity of their thought in their wicked belief. For in dissimulation they have used the phrases, in their thinking dangerously waging war against the Son of God, glorifying shamelessly something altogether alien from the divinity of the Father. (3) So did he [the Father] beget willingly or unwillingly? If we say "unwillingly," we charge the divinity with compulsion; and if say "willingly," we concede that the will existed before the *Logos*. And if there is both a moment and a twinkling <of the eye or> a fraction of an hour, it is indicative of a fraction of time before the *Logos*, and again we fall into their argument. And if we say that he begot unwillingly, then the divinity has been led with a compulsion of nature and not with a freedom of will.³ (4) But there is none of these things in God, as you understand it, O vainglorious one. For these things are not with God. Therefore, neither

2. Cf. Ath., *epistula ad Adelphium* 3.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 69.26.5-6. This was a classic question posed by those who adhered to a subordinating theology.

2. Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1.13-14. The Greek here for "once" is *πότε*.

3. Cf. Gr. Naz., *or.* 29.6.

willingly did he beget nor unwillingly, but with a superiority of his nature. For the divine nature transcends counsel and is not subject to time nor is led by compulsion.⁴ (5) For in us nothing is immediately ready, because we were once not [ready]. And we first deliberate something, then we do what we transact; or when we have not deliberated, there is not yet what has not been transacted by us. But with God all things are perfect and smooth, and all things have been fulfilled in him. And <neither willingly> nor unwillingly, he begot the one who exists eternally, the holy *Logos* and God who has been begotten from him, but in his superior and ineffable nature.⁵

CHAPTER FIFTY-THREE

(1) A great wonder comes to me, O sons of the faith and church, how the lovers of quarrels turned inside out the literal things into allegory, and those who have been led astray understand things which have been said figuratively as literal things.¹ For "to have been begotten," the very thing which is <in> him according to nature, they deny, saying [that he is] not as one of the begotten: but [saying] "to have been created," which is alien from his divinity. And if also in allegory "once" has been said, they say this is literal. But they obscure that which is literal. (2) For in the saying, that Isaiah "saw the Lord Sabaoth,"² and, "the Lord appeared to Moses,"³ and, "the Lord appeared to Abraham,"⁴ and, "Daniel beheld a vision, the Ancient of Days,"⁵ and such things; and the Lord appeared to Ezekiel, and he said, "I saw the form of God";⁶ they [heretics], speaking falsely of the prophets, say that these things were not [literal]. (3) Indeed, from the passage of the Gospel, from which the Savior, teaching, said that "no one has ever seen God,"⁷ they [heretics] even say: "Therefore, if the Only-begotten said that no one has seen, but the prophets say they have seen, it must be that either

4. Cf. *Pan.* 69.26.5-6, 69.70.2-4.

5. Cf. *Gr. Naz., or.* 29.7.

1. Both times, "literal things" = τὰ ἀληθινά.

2. *Is* 6.1.

3. *Ex* 3.2.

4. *Gn* 12.7.

5. *Dn* 7.9.

6. Cf. *Ezek* 1.26.

7. *Jn* 1.18.

the Only-begotten or the prophets are mistaken.”⁸ (4) And according to the argument of those who say thus, as well as of the Manichaeans, the falsehoods will be in the prophets. But if the prophets are not mistaken, but speak truth, according to the word of the Savior that “the one speaking in the prophets, behold I am he,” it is a matter of understanding and a use of allegory.⁹ (5) For even thus often this is fulfilled: we see some part of the sea <from> a hill or plain, and we speak truth in <saying> that we have seen it. And if someone says that he did not see it, he is not speaking falsely, but speaks truth. For he does not know the depth or the length; neither does he know the mass, nor does he know the volume. (6) And from some hole in the roof we behold heaven, but we do not know its extent. And if someone might say, “I saw it,” then he saw it. And if another might say, “I did not see it,” then he did not see it. For we truly saw it as we are able, but we did not see it in so far as it really is. (7) Thus also the prophets, as through a hole of their own narrow body, were deemed worthy to see, and in truth they saw. <But> they did not as one who has a boundless insight. (8) And thus the divine Scriptures have been fulfilled, agreeing with one another, both the prophets saying that they have seen (for they saw in truth), and the Savior saying, “no one has ever clearly seen God”.¹⁰ (they did not see in so far as he really is). But he himself saw the nature in an invisible way, and he has given to the one who is not able to see, a power of a gift for seeing, the power of insight.

CHAPTER FIFTY-FOUR

(1) But may you who fabricate not speak again! On the one hand, they said, “The prophets see not with their eyes, but with their thinking, only perceiving and <not> seeing.” For because of this Isaiah says precisely, “Wretched am I, because I have been stung, because being a man who has unclean lips, I live

8. On this argument, see *Pan.* 70.7.1–8.11, which Epiphanius wrote against the Audians.

9. There is no direct canonical Gospel attestation for this quotation.

10. 1 Jn 4.12.

among a people who have unclean lips, and I saw the Lord Sabaoth.”¹ And he did not say, “I saw with my thought,” but, “with my eyes.” So he saw, and he did not see. But as he was able, in truth he saw, but he did not see, as one who has an infinite inability to comprehend. (2) Thus also concerning Paradise many people allegorize, as the insane Origen wished a fantasy rather than the truth to be introduced to life.² And he says: “Paradise is not on the earth.”³ (3) Indeed, [this is clear] from the passage which has been spoken by the holy Apostle [Paul] that “I know such a man who, fourteen years ago, whether in body I do not know, or outside of the body I do not know (God knows), was snatched up to the third heaven.”⁴ But do not err in judgment and read that [it says] the “third part of the sky”: for when he said “up to the third heaven,” he was not speaking concerning a third part, but concerning three numbers. (4) And he says, “I know such a man snatched up into Paradise and who heard statements which are not allowed for a man to say.”⁵ (5) Glory to the almighty God, to the one who makes clear in every way and specifies precisely, in order that those who are true might not err. For he did not join heaven and Paradise into one simplicity, but “I know a man,” it says, “snatched up to the third heaven,” and again “snatched up to Paradise.”⁶ But there is something distinguishable between the connection of a person and the movement from another place. (6) As if a person had a mountain and a plain, but the plain surrounded the mountain, and he wished to come to the further [side] of the mountain in the same plain. And when he wished to make the journey through

1. Is 6.5.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 64.4.11; *Jer., Ep.* 51.5: Epiphanius accused Origen of (over-)allegorizing many things, including Paradise.

3. Cf. *Pan.* 64.47.1–8, which is itself part of a very long quotation Epiphanius included in the *Panarion*, taken from Methodius, *de resurrectione mortuorum* 1.54.1–56.9. On Methodius and his anti-Origenist thought, see L. Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997); a useful summary can also be found in Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 38–48. On the condemnation of Origen’s (mis-)represented) view of Paradise, see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 334–42.

4. 2 Cor 12.2.

5. 2 Cor 12.3–4.

6. 2 Cor 12.2–3.

the plain to the place, anywhere he wished to depart from the mountain, this will be possible for him. But if he wished first to step onto the mountain and from the mountain to be again in the place of the plain beyond the mountain, thus also is it possible for him. (7) Thus think with me also that which has been said by the Apostle [Paul]: that first he has gone up into heaven, <and then he has descended into Paradise>, according to what has been said: "My beloved went down into his garden."⁷ And the Savior says, "Today you will be with me in Paradise."⁸

CHAPTER FIFTY-FIVE

(1) But if Paradise is not on the earth and the things which have been written in Genesis are not literal but are being allegorized, nothing of the following speaks truth, but all things are being allegorized. (2) "In the beginning," for it says, "God made heaven and earth":¹ and it is not being allegorized, but visible. And firmament, it says, and sea, both crops and trees and plants, pastures, animals, fish, birds, all things which are seen, which have come to be in truth, and he made man to exist in truth.² (3) Therefore, he placed this one whom he formed in Paradise, having made the same man according to his image, according to the image of God.³ (4) Do not investigate thoroughly the gifts of God, that which have been given to man according to grace. For we do not deny that all men are [made] according to the image of God.⁴ (5) And we do not investigate thoroughly the "how" of the "according to the image."⁵ For we think neither the bodily form [is] according to the image, nor the soul nor the mind nor virtue. For all things are preventing me from speaking thus. (6) But we say that neither the body is according to the image, nor the soul. For it is for those who believe to confess the Scripture and not to deny, and for those who do not believe "to reject grace."⁶ So that which is according to the image is in man, but God himself knows how it is

7. Song 6.2.

8. Lk 23.43.

1. Gn 1.1.

4. Cf. *ibid.*

2. Cf. Gn 1.1-27.

5. Cf. *ibid.*

3. Cf. Gn 1.26.

6. Cf. Gal 2.21.

so. (7) For if you say that he made man according to his image and believe that it is a body, and God is invisible, incomprehensible, inconceivable, how will that which is visible and comprehensible and falls subject to [human] contact be in the image of that which is invisible and in-comprehensible? (8) And if you say that the body is not that which was according to his image, "He took," it says, "dust from the earth and fashioned man."⁷ And it [Scripture] calls man the earthly thing, and it calls man the soul-ish thing: for it says, "He blew into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul."⁸ (9) We think the soul created, as well as the body. How is it created? "He blew,"⁹ for it says: and we do not say that the soul is a part of God, nor that it is something alien from the inbreathing. But how according to the fine detail is this to be thought? It is known by God alone.¹⁰

7. Gn 2.7.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. *Anc.* 55 is particularly interesting in view of Epiphanius's later involvement in the Origenist controversy. In the early phase of the controversy, Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria had antagonized a particular faction of Egyptian monks, identified by the moniker "Anthropomorphites," who understood the "image of God" in a most literal way and asserted that God has the various identifiable body parts visible in a man. Soc., *h.e.* 6.7.1-31, described how Theophilus railed against the corporeal view of God but was then confronted by Anthropomorphite monks, whom he appeased by stating: "Thus seeing you, so do I see the face of God"; also cf. Soz., *h.e.* 8.11.1-5. Theophilus then "flip-flopped" from a supportive stance on Origen's theology to an antagonistic one, and he eventually partnered with Jerome and Epiphanius in the controversy. Theophilus was certainly motivated more by political ambition and hostility than from genuine theological conviction; see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 392-414; Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 43-84; Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 191-227; Russell, *Theophilus of Alexandria*, 18-34.

Later in the controversy, the "Anthropomorphites" became a kind of diametric opposite to the "Origenists," who emphasized the total incorporeality of God. According to Jer., *c. Ioan.* 10-14, Epiphanius was in Jerusalem in 394 as a guest of Bishop John of Jerusalem, whom he suspected of being an Origenist sympathizer, and both bishops waged a passive-aggressive war of words through public sermons in which each man accused the other of heretical views. John apparently preached a sermon against the Anthropomorphites and insinuated through his gestures that Epiphanius was numbered among them, to which Epiphanius responded in his own sermon: "All that has been said against the heresy of the Anthropomorphites by my brother and colleague, my son in age,

CHAPTER FIFTY-SIX

(1) Simply and without guile we believe in God who speaks truth in everything. And if you say that the soul is that which is according to his image, <listen> to the Apostle who says that "the living word of God is both active and sharper than any double-edged sword and piercing as far as the parts of the soul."¹

(2) Therefore, if the soul has parts, but God is indivisible, how is the soul able to be that which is according to his image? For the soul does not know the future, but God knows in all ways. And we see the things in front of the body, but we are ignorant of the things behind. And if you say that it is not the soul, in all ways it is because it [Scripture] also has called the soul, "man,"² and a man is soul and body. (3) But you might say that the mind is that which is according to his image. <But> Scripture says, "I see another law waging war in my members and taking me captive in my mind with the law of sin which is in my members."³ So how will that which is being taken captive be according to his image? [So it says] that "I will sing with my mind; I will sing with

has been said well and faithfully. What has been condemned, I also do with my voice. But equally in the manner in which we have condemned this heresy, we ought also to condemn the perverse doctrines of Origen" (Jer., c. *Ioan.* 11). This particular passage of *Anc.* seems to affirm Epiphanius's rejection of any Anthropomorphite understanding of the "image of God" in man. On the Anthropomorphites, see G. Florovsky, "The Anthropomorphites in the Egyptian Desert," in *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München 1958*, ed. F. Dölger, H.-G. Beck (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1960), 154-59; idem, "Theophilus of Alexandria and Apa Aphou of Pemdje," in *Harry Aufstryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume: On the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, English Section*, ed. S. Lieberman (Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965), 275-310; A. Golitzin, "The Vision of God and the Form of Glory: More Reflections on the Anthropomorphite Controversy of AD 399," in *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West. Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia*, ed. J. Behr, A. Louth, D. Conomos (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 273-97; G. Gould, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in *Origeniana Quinta. Papers of the 5th International Origen Congress, Boston College, 14-18 August 1989*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 105, ed. R. Daly (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 549-57.

1. Heb 4.12.

2. Cf. 1 Cor 15.45.

3. Rom 7.23.

my spirit."⁴ (4) And if you say virtue is that which is according to his image, I will say to you: Speak to me about Adam. What sort of virtue did he practice before he was fashioned? For he was not existing in the beginning, but from the beginning he was fashioned according to his image. And if you say that it is not virtue, you do not speak rightly. For what is fitting to be that which is according to his image except virtue? But before virtue, man was fashioned according to his image. For Adam was not yet living in virtue; it is clear he was not [yet] being created. (5) And if you say baptism is that which is according to his image, then were the just ones, who had not received baptism, not [made] according to his image? For from Moses and the sea the type began, from John the grace was laid open, but in Christ the gift was completed.⁵

CHAPTER FIFTY-SEVEN

(1) So all [people] have that which is according to his image, but not according to his nature. For not according to equality with God do men have that which is according to his image. For God is incomprehensible, inconceivable, being spirit,¹ and Spirit over all spirits, and Light over all light. (2) What he gave, we do not despoil: for true is the one who gave with grace to man that which is according to his image. And it is possible to think from similar things: (3) for we see that the Savior took into his hands, as it has it in the Gospel, when he was reclining at supper and took these things and having given thanks said, "This is of me, these things,"² and he gave to his disciples and said, "This is of me, these things." (4) And we see that it is not an equal nor a similar thing to the incarnate image, nor to the invisible divinity, nor to the characteristics of the members [of the body]. For on the one hand it [bread] is of a round shape, <on the other hand it [divinity] is?> <infinite> and imperceptible. (5) <But they are

4. 1 Cor 14.15.

5. Cf. 1 Cor 10.1-2. Cf. Bas., *Spir.* 14.31-33, on the meaning of the type of baptism of Moses and the sea. See Haykin, *The Spirit of God*, 129-37.

1. Cf. Jn 4.24.

2. Cf. Mt 26.26-28; Mk 14.22-24; Lk 22.14-20.

similar?> as to the meaning, and he wished to say with grace, "This is of me, these things,"³ and no one disbelieves his word. For the one who does not believe that he is true in what he said falls out of grace and of salvation. (6) Since we heard, let us also believe. We believe that it is his <body?>, and we know our Lord is wholly perception, wholly perceptible, wholly God, wholly the one who moves, wholly the one who acts, wholly light, wholly *Logos*, incomprehensible, but with grace this has been given to us.

CHAPTER FIFTY-EIGHT

(1) Therefore, this Adam was placed in Paradise and ate from the tree. Paradise, it says, "in Eden towards the east":¹ "A stream was rising up from Eden,"² and it did not say, "was descending down," in order that we might not believe that Eden is in heaven.³ For if it were in heaven, it would say the source descends from above. But it says, "A river flows out from Eden,"⁴ and it did not say "descends."⁵ (2) This [river] "is separated into four branches. The name of the first is Pishon,"⁶ and we see the Pishon with our own sight. And Pishon is the one called Ganges by the Indians and Ethiopians, but the *Hellenes* call this the Indus river. "For it surrounds all of Havilah,"⁷ little Ethiopia and the great, the parts of Havilites, and it passes through great Ethiopia and falls into the south and enters inside Cadiz into the great Ocean. (3) A second river is "Gihon."⁸ And we see that it is a perceptible river and not being allegorized. For this is the one, which descending down Ethiopia and passing through little Ethiopia, Nubia, and Blemmua and Axiomititis, and flooding the parts of the Thebaid and of Egypt, comes out into this sea. But if someone does not believe, let him listen to Jeremiah, who says, "What is there for you even in the land of Egypt, for drinking the turbid water of Gihon?"⁹ (4) "A third," it says, "is the river Tigris, the one going opposite from the Assyrians."¹⁰

3. Cf. *ibid.*

1. Gn 2.8.

4. Gn 2.10.

7. Gn 2.11.

10. Gn 2.14.

2. Gn 2.6.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 64.47.1-2.

8. Gn 2.13.

3. Cf. Jer., *Ep.* 51.5.

6. Gn 2.10-11.

9. Jer 2.18.

For it cuts through the parts of Anatolia and enters under the land and gushes forth from Armenia down the middle of [the land of] the Cardians and Armenians and springs up again and cuts through the land of Assyrians. (5) But there is also a fourth river, Euphrates,¹¹ in like manner similarly to the same place entering under the land, it rises up from Armenia and thus floods Persia. (6) Therefore, if there is no perceptible Paradise, neither is there a source: if there is not a source, there is not a river. If there is not a river, there are not four branches. If there is not a Pishon, there is not a Gihon; there is not a Tigris. If there is not a Tigris, there is not a Euphrates. (7) If there is not a Euphrates, there is not a fig-tree; there are not plants; there is not an Adam; there is not an eating; there is not an Eve. If there is not an Eve, she did not eat from the tree. (8) If she did not eat from the tree, there is not an Adam. If there is not an Adam, there are not men. But the truth is then a myth, and all things are allegorized. Therefore, there is an Adam. For we are from him, we all being his race according to succession, and we see him through the multitude of people in succession.

CHAPTER FIFTY-NINE

(1) For Adam begets Seth according to his likeness and according to his image. In order that no one might believe that someone else has been formed and others have been begotten, because of this Scripture says, “according to his likeness and according to his image.”¹ Seth² begets Enosh, Enosh [begets] Kenan, Kenan Ma-halalel, Ma-halalel Jared, and Jared Enoch, Enoch Methuselah, Methuselah Lamech, Lamech Noah,³ and a flood has come to be, not in allegory but in truth, and it killed every soul, and “eight souls”⁴ of men remained. (2) Again if you hear “souls,” do not believe that they did not have bodily forms. For from the one form, the entire man is called such. For the

11. Cf. *ibid.*

1. Gn 5.3.

2. Orthographic conventions for the proper names adopted from the NRSV.

3. Cf. Gn 5.6–32.

4. 1 Pt 3.20.

Scripture says, "Jacob descended into Egypt, with seventy-five souls,"⁵ not that the souls were without bodies, but with bodies.⁶ It [Scripture] has called the entire man, "souls." And "we were in the ship, as eighty souls,"⁷ says Luke, the one who wrote the Acts of the Apostles.⁸ (3) And custom has been wont to call slaves "bodies." He is master, it says, of one hundred bodies, but which also have souls. Since the power of a master rules over the bodies of men but not their souls, because of this it [custom] reasonably called slaves "bodies" (with souls), in order that it might show the use of the bodies. (4) Noah went out from the ark, having begotten Shem, Ham, Japheth. Shem begets Arpachshad; Arpachshad begets Cainan, Cainan [begets] Shelah, Shelah Eber, Eber Peleg, Peleg Reu, Reu Serug, Serug Nahor, Nahor Terah, Terah Abraham,⁹ Abraham Isaac, Isaac Jacob, Jacob Judah, Judah Perez, Perez Hezron, Hezron Aram, Aram Amminadab, Amminadab Nahshon, Nahshon Salmon, Salmon Boaz, Boaz Obed from Ruth, Obed Jesse, Jesse David the king, David Solomon from the wife of Uriah, Solomon Rehoboam, Rehoboam Abijah, Abijah Asa, Asa Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat Joram, Joram Ochozias, Ochozias Joash, Joash Amaziah, Amaziah Uzziah, the one called Azariah, Uzziah Jotham, Jotham Ahaz, Ahaz Hezekiah, Hezekiah Manasseh, Manasseh Amos, Amos Josiah, Josiah Jechoniah, Jechoniah in turn She-alti-el, She-alti-el Zerubbabel, Zerubbabel Abiud, Abiud Eliakim, Eliakim Azor, Azor Zadok, Zadok Achim, Achim Eliud, Eliud Eleazar, Eleazar Matthan, Matthan Jacob, Jacob Joseph.¹⁰

CHAPTER SIXTY

(1) Joseph being an old man <and> widower after the taking his first wife and making from her four male children: Jacob [James], who is called the brother of the Lord because he was reared together with him, and Simon and Jude and Josés, and

5. Acts 7.14-15.

6. Cf. *Pan.* 8.4.5.

7. Acts 27.37.

8. The text of Acts has 276 persons in the ship.

9. Cf. Gn 11.10-26; Lk 3.23-38.

10. Cf. Mt 1.2-16.

two daughters Anna and Salome. (2) This Joseph, being old and a widower, according to the necessity of lots thrown for widowers and unmarried men, according to each tribe for the virgins from the Temple (on account of the consecration of the first-born children in the Temple, both males and females), took, according to a lot, the holy Virgin Mary, “from whom,” according to the flesh, “he was born,”¹ our Lord Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, not from the seed of a man nor by a union of body.² (3) Therefore, the Lord was born from the line of Judah, from the seed of David and Abraham according to the flesh, being God, in the forty-<second> year of the reign of Augustus.³ (4) Augustus ruled fifty-six years and six months, and after him his son Tiberius succeeds the rule for twenty-three years. After Tiberius, Gaius [ruled] for three years, nine months, twenty-two days; after Gaius, Claudius for thirteen years; after Claudius, Nero for thirteen years; after Nero, Vespasian for nine years; after Vespasian, his son Titus for two years; after Titus, his brother Domitian for fifteen years and five months; after Domitian, Nerva for one year and four months; after Nerva, Trajan for nineteen years; after Trajan, Hadrian for twenty-one years; after Hadrian, Antoninus Pius for twenty-two years; after Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Verus, nineteen years. Commodus [ruled] for thirteen years; Pertinax for six months; Severus for eighteen years; his son Antoninus for six years; Macrinus for one year; another Antoninus [II] for four years; Alexander, not the Macedonian, for thirteen years; Maximinus for three years; Gordian for six years; Philip for six years; Decius for one year; Gallus and Volusianus for three years; Gallienus for fifteen years; another Claudius [II] for one year; Aurelian for four and a half years; Tacitus for six months; Probus for six years; the circle of Carus and Carinus and Numerianus for two years;

1. Mt 1.16.

2. Epiphanius vigorously defended the idea that Mary remained a virgin, even after the birth of Christ. In *Pan.* 78, he wrote against the Antidicomarians, whom he believed emerged in Arabia, and in his entry included a letter, written specifically to Christians in Arabia, in which he explained that Joseph married Mary when he was already eighty.

3. I have translated and spelled the names of emperors according to common American English usage.

Diocletian for twenty years. (5) After Diocletian, Maximian, Licinius, Constantius, Constantine, Constans, Constantius [II] and Constantine [II], Julian, Jovian, Valentinian, Valens, Gratian up to this point after Diocletian dying, seventy years.⁴ For this year is the ninetieth of Diocletian, the tenth of Valentinian and Valens, and the sixth year of Gratian, in the third consulship of Gratian Augustus and Equitius, the most illustrious, the second Indiction.⁵

CHAPTER SIXTY-ONE

(1) Therefore, we all are in accordance with the ordering from the aforementioned Adam, and the order was not undone, nor are the things that are brought about by God allegorized. (2) Therefore, there is Adam, and there are leaves of the fig-tree, and the fig tree, and the Tree of the Knowing of Good and Evil, and the Tree of Life in the center of Paradise, and the serpent, and disobedience, and obedience, and there are rivers; and there is Eve and the bodily form. (3) "For all things are possible with God":¹ both to change the corruptible things into incorruption and to make the things on the earth to persevere in incorruption. (4) And let no one marvel: for he [the Son] came and showed this, having assumed corruptible flesh and "clothing" it on the divinity and having demonstrated himself incorruptible. "For who will accuse"² God? (5) And let us behold another insight. He expelled them, it says, outside of Paradise and placed Cherubim and the flaming sword to guard the entrance of the Tree of Life. And Adam and his family, having gone out, dwelt opposite Paradise. (6) Let no one be deceived by vain myths. "For God is able to raise up children from stones,"³ and God is able even to change corruptible things into

4. The list from Aurelian to Gratian was repeated in *Pan.* 66.20.4. Holl, 71, indicates in the notes that the list was based on Eus., *Chronicon*.

5. Cf. Epiph., *de mensuris et ponderibus* 18-20 (from Antoninus Pius to the reigns of Arcadius and Honorius, when the treatise was composed).

1. Mt 19.26.

2. Wis 12.12.

3. Mt 3.9.

incorruption and is able to make on the earth a resting place of Paradise, when he so wished. (7) For the earth is not of one god and heaven of another, but all things are his; and as he wishes, he gives as a gift incorruption to each. (8) For we also know the body of Adam has been formed from the earth, from which also our bodies [have been formed], and we have hope of everlasting life and of an incorruptible inheritance. For even the body of the Savior was from Mary and was united spiritually with the incorruption of the *Logos* in heaven. (9) All these things we collected together and provided them here, wishing to cast aside nothing of what has been written, but rather with simplicity to be presented and to be found faithful with respect to God, in which things in truth he wrote for us and gave the path of truth for our salvation: and it is fitting to yield to him alone to know the incomprehensible things.

CHAPTER SIXTY-TWO

(1) This Origen introduced another mythical theory, in which allegorizing, God might ascribe appearances to men, when he [Origen] asserts that what the holy Scripture said are skin garments that God has made for Adam and his family were not skin garments: (2) "But," he says, "this skin garment was the fleshiness of the body or the body itself." "For after the disobedience," he says, "and after the eating from the tree, he [God] clad the souls in these bodies, that is, the flesh."¹ (3) And the whole saying is silly. For Origen himself really speculates and says: "for was God a leather-worker, in order that having worked leather he fashioned skin garments for Adam and Eve? Such a thing is most irrational!"² (4) What was easier, that God made heaven and earth out of nothing, or skin garments? For when did he not perform his miracles as he wished, and when has he not been able to change inanimate things into animate things? (5) The rod of Moses, being dry and wooden, he made an animate snake which follows

1. Epiphanius reiterated his attack at length on Origen's allegorical interpretation of the "skin garments" in *Pan.* 64.63.5-65.28. See Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 315-33.

2. Cf. Jer., *Ep.* 51.5.

Moses, from which Moses was turning in flight, in order that he might show that it was not an apparition, but something which came to be true. How for forty years did the clothing of the people not wear out and was their hair not growing long and were their shoes not wearing out? (6) Let the silly men, who followed the madness of Origen on this topic, speak to me. With the Savior having risen from the dead and having cast aside the linens in the tomb, as it has been written, was he then appearing naked to his disciples, having risen from the dead with his body and soul? (7) When he was showing to those with Thomas his bones and flesh, hands, and side, clearly he was not naked. Therefore, who wove clothing for him after the Resurrection? (8) But you will say to me, the garments were entirely spiritual, [which] he made for himself. And if he was able to make such garments for himself, was he not able to make those skin garments for Adam and his family by his own will? Truly the allegory of Origen fails. (9) For if after the eating from the Tree, the flesh was created for Adam, from where, then, did God take the rib before he ate? As he was roused from the trance he says, "This is bones from my bones and flesh from my flesh."³

CHAPTER SIXTY-THREE

(1) "Therefore, in the future let no one cause troubles for us."¹ For thus the holy church of God forms a belief from the things from above. For Origen will not stand with us in the day of judgment. (2) For I marvel truly, how some trust in one who blasphemed his master. Such people ought to read the *Peri archon* of Origen, and the ones who suppose that they are sons of the catholic church ought to learn. And let them not dare to separate the Son from the divinity of the Father. (3) How possibly did Origen not deem it worthy to say that the Son sees the Father? But he says: "As the Son is not able to see the Father, the Holy Spirit is also not able to see the Son," and again, "The angels are not able to see the Holy Spirit, and men are

3. Gn 2.23.

1. Gal 6.17.

not able to see the angels.”² (4) And he deluded himself rather and those whom he deceived, but not the understanding one and faithful one and the one who believes in the truth and in the spiritual teaching. (5) Therefore, cease, Origen, and cease, you disciples of Origen. For the apostles and the prophets speak truth rather than you and your teacher. (6) Cease, you Gnostics, who are “knowledgeable” of the way, and cease, you Valentinians and Manichaeans and Marcionites, who have been led astray in all things. And cease, you Arians and Anomoeans and Sabelians and *Pneumatitai*, also [known as] the Pneumatomachoi, and Dimoerites, who foolishly cast aside the mind [of Christ]. (7) For the divine Scripture speaks truth in every way. But there is need of understanding for knowing God, to believe in him and his words, and [for knowing] the things which have been given freely by God and the things which have been given and the things which will be, and to know [God] according to the promise, the resurrection of the dead in perfection. For every heresy deceives, not having received the Holy Spirit according to the tradition of the Fathers in the holy catholic church of God.

CHAPTER SIXTY-FOUR

(1) And concerning all of these things, again in turn we will speak in accordance with our weakness. But from God deemed worthy of the holy catholic church of God and worthy also to have the foundation of this [church], we the least and lowly, according to the ability of our smallness provide in part concerning all things for those who wish to take care of their life. (2) That which has been said concerning the Father and Son and Holy Spirit was adequately sufficient. But in order that we might endeavor to explain more than sufficiently for the joy and preservation and assurance of those who believe, we gather together from all sides the testimonies of the divine Scripture for a breadth of festivity and exultation for the faithful who read them.¹ Again would that we not hesitate to indicate, as steadfast

2. Cf. *Pan.* 64.4.3-4; *Or., princ.* 1.1.8.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 69.27.3. Epiphanius repeated this claim of gathering the testimonies from Scripture in 74.1 below.

and certain in God, our hope, that nothing has been changed in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, but that the holy Trinity is of the same rank² and *homoousios*.³ (3) Not from one place or another, nor from our own thoughts, do we make this teaching, but from our life, that is, from the Prophets and from the *parousia* of our Savior and his benevolence. (4) For he came; our life came and indicated the light again to us, finding us who have been led astray. For we were; we had been baptized in arrogance and blasphemies, the likenesses of idols, the atheisms of spirits, the commands of all evils. (5) Therefore, while I was unwillingly attached to these things ("for I was not doing what I was wishing, but I was being driven on to do what I was hating," thus with sin serving me),⁴ the holy Father sent his holy Son and in his mercy saved me and rescued me from all my downfalls.

CHAPTER SIXTY-FIVE

(1) "For the grace of our Lord and Savior appeared, teaching us in order that we, having renounced impiety and worldly desires, might live prudently, piously, and justly in the present age, awaiting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, in order that he might ransom us from all lawlessness and might purify for himself a special people, zealous for good works."¹ (2) "Having wiped out the debt record against us (with its ordinances), which was against us, he has taken it up from our midst, having nailed it to the cross; having stripped off the rulers and authorities, he made an example of them in the open, having triumphed over them in it."² "Having shattered bronze doors and crushed iron bars,"³ he indicated again the light of life, stretching out his hand, making a way, indicating the

2. "same rank" = ὁμόστοιχος.

3. Cf. *Anc.* 6.3-6, 26.1, 118.10. 119.4 for parallel uses of the term.

4. Cf. *Rom* 7.19.

1. *Ti* 2.11-14. In his entry against the Pneumatomachoi (*Pan.* 74.2.1-10.9), Epiphanius quoted *Anc.* 65.1-73.9.

2. *Col* 2.14-15.

3. *Is* 45.2.

foundations of the heavens, deigning to live again in Paradise. (3) Therefore, "he lived among us";⁴ and having given to us "the righteous act of the law"⁵ of the Spirit for knowing him, because the things concerning him are the beginning and end of life, he has become "a law of righteousness"⁶ for us, "a law of faith,"⁷ "a law of Spirit,"⁸ free from the "law of sinful flesh."⁹ (4) On which account "I rejoice with the law of God in accordance with the inner man."¹⁰ Our inner [man] is Christ, if indeed he lives in us. (5) For he who died has become a way of life on our behalf, in order that "the living no longer live for themselves, but for the one who died and was raised for us,"¹¹ for the cause of life: "having remembered his oath for all peoples,"¹² according to David; "God was, in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning to them their transgressions,"¹³ (6) "because in him all the fullness was pleased to dwell and through him to reconcile all things to himself, having made peace through the blood of the cross."¹⁴ (7) Therefore, he came near "in an economy for the fullness of the times,"¹⁵ even as he has promised to Abraham and to the rest of the saints, "to restore all things in him, the things in heaven and the things on the earth."¹⁶ (8) There was a separation and enmity "in the long-suffering of God,"¹⁷ "but he reconciled in the body of his flesh,"¹⁸ "having made both into one through him"¹⁹ (for he came, "our peace"),²⁰ and, "having destroyed the dividing wall of partition, the enmity, in his flesh, having rendered powerless the law of the commandments in its ordinances, in order that he might create the two into one new man."²¹ He commanded "the nations to be one body and sharers and joint-heirs of the promise,"²² having said, "Come to me, all you who are weary and have been burdened, and I will give you rest."²³ (9) Therefore, "in what I was weak through the flesh," the Savior was sent to me "in likeness of sinful flesh,"²⁴

4. Cf. Jn 1.14.

7. Rom 3.27.

10. Rom 7.22.

13. 2 Cor 5.19.

16. Ibid.

19. Eph 2.14.

22. Eph 3.6.

5. Rom 8.4.

8. Rom 8.2.

11. 2 Cor 5.15.

14. Col 1.19-20.

17. Rom 3.25.

20. Ibid.

23. Mt 11.28.

6. Rom 9.31.

9. Rom 7.25.

12. Cf. Ps 104.8.

15. Eph 1.10.

18. Eph 2.16.

21. Eph 2.14-16.

24. Rom 8.3.

fulfilling such an economy, in order that "he might redeem"²⁵ me from slavery, in order that [he might redeem] me from destruction, in order that [he might redeem] me from death, and he became for me "righteousness and sanctification and redemption."²⁶ (10) [He became our] righteousness, having destroyed sin through his faith; sanctification, by setting [us] free through water and spirit and in his word; and redemption, through handing himself over, his blood, a ransom of the true Lamb on my behalf, a propitiation for the purification of the world, for the reconciliation of all of heaven and earth, "the mystery hidden before the ages and generations,"²⁷ fulfilling the times which have been determined. (11) He himself "will change the form of the body of our humiliation for becoming conformed with his glory according to the activity of his being able even to subject all things to himself,"²⁸ "because in him all the fullness of the divinity dwells bodily."²⁹

CHAPTER SIXTY-SIX

(1) Therefore, the receptacle of wisdom and of divinity, Christ, acting as a mediator, "reconciles all things to God in himself, not reckoning sins,"¹ fulfilling the hidden mysteries by faith in his covenant, which has been foretold by the Law and the Prophets, being declared Son of God, being called Son of David: for he is both, God and man, "mediator of God and men,"² true "house of God,"³ "holy priesthood,"⁴ giver of the Holy Spirit, the one [the Holy Spirit] who regenerates and renews again all things to God. Because "the *Logos* became flesh, and dwelt among us,"⁵ and "we saw his glory as the glory of the Only-begotten from the Father."⁶ (2) The rain, which combines its nature with trees and plants, produces bodies, and each is in the likeness of fruit; and in the olive the olive-oil becomes rich, receiving its essence from it; and

25. Cf. Gal 4.5.

26. 1 Cor 1.30.

27. Col 1.26.

28. Phil 3.21.

29. Col 2.9.

1. Cf. 2 Cor 5.18-19.

2. 1 Tm 2.5.

3. There are numerous biblical passages that include this phrase.

4. 1 Pt 2.5.

5. Jn 1.14.

6. Ibid.

on the vine the sweet wine deepens in color; and on the fig-tree the fig becomes sweet, and in each of the seeds according to its form it ripens.⁷ (3) Thus I believe the *Logos* of God in Mary became flesh, and in the seed of Abraham he was found as a man according to the promise. "For we found Messiah, whom Moses wrote about."⁸ And as Moses was saying, "Let my utterance come down as the rain,"⁹ and David [said], "Let him come down as rain upon fleece and as drops falling upon the earth,"¹⁰ (4) (therefore, wool receiving the dew ripens the seed of the fleece, and the earth, receiving the rain, ripens the fruit of hope of farmers for receiving with the commandment of the Master; [the earth,] giving forth growth, readily hurries for receiving more from him); (5) thus indeed the Virgin Mary also, when she says, "according to what, will I know,"¹¹ "that this will be for me?"¹² she heard, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you: and on this account, that which is born from you will be holy and will be called Son of the Most High."¹³ (6) Christ speaks in an angel, and the Master refashions himself in the mold of himself, "taking the form of a slave";¹⁴ and Mary absorbs the *Logos* in conception, as the earth does the rain, and the *Logos* of God produces himself as a holy fruit, taking the nature of a mortal.¹⁵ (7) This was from the same absorption as the earth and fleece, the fruit of true hope, for the saints in expectation, just as Elizabeth was saying, "Blessed are you among women and blessed is the fruit of your womb,"¹⁶ which [fruit] the impassible *Logos* grasped, from the sufferings of humanity. (8) This one is "the living bread, the one who came down from heaven"¹⁷ and giving life; this one is the fruit of the true olive-tree, the olive

7. Cf. Cyr. H., *catech.* 16.12, in which he drew a parallel with rain water and the Spirit.

8. Jn 1.41, 45.

9. Dt 32.2.

10. Ps 71.6.

11. Lk 1.18.

12. Lk 1.34.

13. Lk 1.35.

14. Phil 2.7.

15. On Epiphanius's understanding and (limited) use of the term *φύσις*, especially in view of his Christological views and those which develop into controversy in the fifth century, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 350–52. In the *Anc.* Epiphanius used *φύσις* almost exclusively in relation to the divinity, except here in 66.6.

16. Lk 1.42.

17. Jn 6.51.

oil of the anointing and of the compounding, which Moses prescribed before.¹⁸ This one is the "true vine,"¹⁹ which the Father alone cultivates, which has produced a cluster of grapes of joy for us; (9) this one is "living water, which <the> man who thirsts, receiving it, will not thirst again, but which is in his belly, springing up into everlasting life."²⁰ Receiving from this, the new farmers gave a share to the world, but old farmers brought withering and ruin through unbelief. (10) By his own blood he sanctifies the nations, and by his own Spirit he leads the chosen up into heaven. "As many as are led by his Spirit, these"²¹ live in God; and as many as are not, these, who still have been reckoned to death, are truly called soul-ish and fleshly. (11) Therefore, he commands [us] to set aside the works of the flesh, which are strongholds of sin, and to mortify the members of death through his grace and to receive the Holy Spirit, whom we did not have, the one who makes me alive who "died" long ago. Wherefore I, not receiving [the Spirit], will have been dead, for apart from his Spirit all are dead. (12) "Therefore, if his Spirit is in us, the one who raised him from the dead will make alive our dead bodies through his Spirit living in us."²² But, I believe, both Christ and his Spirit dwell in the just man.

CHAPTER SIXTY-SEVEN

(1) If Christ is believed [to be] from the Father, as God from God, and the Spirit [is] from Christ or from both¹ (as Christ says, "who proceeds from the Father," and "this one will receive from what is mine"; and Christ from the Holy Spirit, "for that which is in her," the voice of the angel says, "is from the Holy Spirit"),² I should understand the mystery that delivers me by faith, by hearing alone, by love for the one who came to me. (2) For God knows himself; Christ proclaims himself; the Holy Spirit manifests himself to the saints. In the holy Scriptures the Trinity is proclaimed to us and is believed simply, without strife

18. Cf. Ex 30.22-25.

19. Jn 15.1.

20. Jn 4.13-14.

21. Rom 8.14.

22. Rom 8.11.

1. See 75 n. 4, above, on the question of the Spirit's "procession."

2. Jn 15.26; 16.14; Mt 1.20.

<from> a hearing of that which has been agreed. (3) From this faith is the salvation of grace, “the righteousness from faith apart from works of the law”:³ <for> it has been written that from the “hearing of faith,”⁴ the “Spirit of Christ”⁵ is given to those who are saved. (4) This very faith is indicated in general by the expressions of the heralds, as I myself believe, being instructed from the Scriptures: thrice holy, thrice equally holy,⁶ thrice existent, thrice coexistent, thrice endowed with form,⁷ thrice with equal form, thrice active, thrice co-active, thrice enhypostatic,⁸ thrice with *hypostasis*⁹ joined with one another.¹⁰ This Trinity is called holy, being three, one concord, one divinity of the same *ousia*, of the same divinity, of the same *hypostasis*,¹¹ like from like, working an equality of grace of Father and of Son and of Holy Spirit. (5) And how to teach to others is left open [to God]. “For no one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father and to whom the Son might reveal.”¹² And he reveals through the Holy Spirit. (6) Accordingly, these, being three, whether of him or from him or with him, for each, are they being thought about worthily, even as he reveals them as light, fire, wind, and I believe with other likenesses of visions, as the man being supplied is worthy.¹³ (7) Therefore, God himself, the one who said in the beginning, “Let there be light, and light came to be,”¹⁴ which was visible, is the same as the one who illuminated us to see “the light,” “the true one, who comes into the world, illuminating all men.”¹⁵ (“Send your light and your truth,” says David.)¹⁶ He is the same Lord who said, “In the fi-

3. Rom 3.28.

4. Gal 3.2.

5. Rom 8.9.

6. *συνάγια*.

7. Not in the sense of corporeal form, but subsistent existence.

8. *τρία ἐνυπόστατα*.

9. *τρία συνυπόστατα*.

10. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 250–51, for explanations of the different terms Epiphanius used in this formulation.

11. Epiphanius here does not seem to indicate three distinct *hypostaseis*, but one, same *hypostasis*. Contrast this with the words he attributed to the “heretic” in *Anc.* 81.4, a confession of the three *hypostaseis*.

12. Mt 11.27.

13. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 252–54, for an extensive explanation of these prepositional expressions.

14. Gn 1.3.

15. Jn 1.9.

16. Ps 42.3.

nal days I will pour out from my Spirit upon all flesh, and their sons and their daughters will prophesy, and their youths will see visions,"¹⁷ showing to us three Persons of holy worship, from a *hypostasis* which is threefold.¹⁸

CHAPTER SIXTY-EIGHT

(1) "So I say that Christ has become a servant of the circumcision on behalf of the truth of God for the fulfillment of the promises,"¹ and that the Holy Spirit serves together [with him]. We have received from the divine Scriptures thus: Christ is sent out from the Father; the Holy Spirit is sent out. Christ speaks in the saints; the Holy Spirit speaks. Christ heals; the Holy Spirit heals; Christ sanctifies; the Holy Spirit sanctifies; Christ baptizes in his name, the Holy Spirit baptizes. (2) Thus the Scriptures say: "You will send your Spirit, and you will renew the face of the earth,"² which is similar to the saying, "You will send forth your word and you will consume all things."³ (3) "While," it says, "they were worshiping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, 'Indeed, set aside for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them,'"⁴ which is similar to the saying, "The Lord said, 'Enter into the city, and there it will be told to you what it is necessary for you to do.'"⁵ (4) "So having been sent out by the Holy Spirit, they went down into Seleucia,"⁶ is as Christ would say, "Behold, I send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves."⁷ (5) "For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit that no other burden more than necessary be added,"⁸ is as one would say, "I myself do not speak, but the Lord, that a wife should not be separated from her husband."⁹ (6) "They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been prevented by the Holy Spirit from speaking the word in Asia. But coming to Mysia

17. J1 2.28.

18. See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 255-59, 366-67, for the implications on Epiphanius's use of these terms, especially *πρόσωπον* and *ὑπόστασις* in his development and understanding of Trinitarian theology.

1. Rom 15.8.

2. Ps 103.30.

3. Ps 147.7.

4. Acts 13.2.

5. Acts 9.6.

6. Acts 13.4.

7. Mt 10.16.

8. Acts 15.28.

9. 1 Cor 7.10.

they were trying to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit did not allow them,"¹⁰ is as Christ would say, "Going forth, baptize every nation,"¹¹ <or> "Do not take a purse, a walking stick, or sandals."¹² (7) "Who," it says, "were saying to Paul through the Spirit not to go up into Jerusalem,"¹³ or Agabus [said], "The Holy Spirit says such things, the man whose belt this is,"¹⁴ is similar to what Paul said, "If you seek proof of Christ who speaks in me?"¹⁵ or "Remember the words of the Lord, that he said, 'it is good to give rather than to receive.'"¹⁶ (8) "And now behold, I myself, having been bound by the Spirit, go,"¹⁷ is as he would say, "Paul, a captive of Jesus Christ."¹⁸ (9) "Except the Spirit warns me, saying in every city,"¹⁹ is similar to the saying, "<The> Lord bears witness to my soul that I do not lie."²⁰ (10) "In power according to a spirit of holiness,"²¹ is similar to the saying, "Holy is the one resting in the saints."²² (11) And "circumcision of the heart in Spirit,"²³ is similar to the saying, "And you were circumcised with a circumcision not done by human hands in the putting off of the body of sins, in the circumcision of Christ."²⁴ (12) "If indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you,"²⁵ is similar to the saying, "As you received Christ, walk in him,"²⁶ and, "The Spirit of the Lord spoke in me, and his word was in my mouth."²⁷ (13) And "having the first-fruits of the Spirit,"²⁸ is similar to the saying, "Christ the first-fruits."²⁹ (14) "But the Spirit himself intercedes on our behalf,"³⁰ is similar to the saying, "who is at the right hand of God, who even intercedes at our behalf."³¹ (15) "In order that the offering of the nations might be acceptable, being sanctified in the Holy Spirit,"³² is similar to the saying, "Would that the Lord sanctify you, in order that you might be pure and blameless in the day of Christ."³³ (16) "God revealed to us through his Spirit,"³⁴ is similar to the saying, "when the one who set me apart from the womb of my mother was well pleased through his grace

10. Acts 16.6–7.

13. Acts 21.4.

16. Acts 20.35.

19. Acts 20.23.

22. Is 57.15 LXX.

25. 1 Cor 3.16.

28. Rom 8.23.

31. Rom 8.34.

34. 1 Cor 2.10.

11. Mt 28.19.

14. Acts 21.10–11.

17. Acts 20.22.

20. Cf. Gal 1.20.

23. Cf. Rom 2.29.

26. Col 2.6.

29. 1 Cor 15.23.

32. Rom 15.16.

12. Mt 10.10; Lk 10.4.

15. 2 Cor 13.3.

18. Eph 3.1; Phlm 1.

21. Rom 1.4.

24. Col 2.11.

27. 2 Sm 23.2.

30. Rom 8.26.

33. Phil 1.10.

to reveal his Son in me.”³⁵ (17) “We did not receive the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God,”³⁶ is similar to the saying, “Test yourselves, if Christ is in you.”³⁷ (18) “You are a temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you,”³⁸ is similar to the saying, “I will dwell in them and will walk [among them], and I will be their God and they will be my people.”³⁹

CHAPTER SIXTY-NINE

(1) But he [Paul] also says that justification and grace are from both: “justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God,”¹ is similar to the saying, “Justified from faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”² (2) “No one is able to say that Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit,”³ and no one is able to receive the Holy Spirit except from the Lord; “There are differences of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of services, but the same Lord; and there are differences of activities, but the same God who is accomplishing all things in all,”⁴ and “from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, Spirit.”⁵ (3) And “Do not grieve the Holy Spirit, in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption,”⁶ is similar to the saying, “Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?”⁷ (4) “The Spirit says expressly,”⁸ is similar to the saying, “The Lord almighty says such things.”⁹ (5) And “My Spirit has stood in your midst,”¹⁰ <is similar to the saying>, “If someone opens the door for me, I and the Father will enter, and we will make our dwelling with him.”¹¹ (6) Isaiah [said], “and the Spirit of God is upon him,”¹² and Christ [said], “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, on account of which he anointed me”;¹³ and “God anointed Jesus, the one from Nazareth, with the Holy

35. Gal 1.15-16.

38. 1 Cor 3.16.

36. 1 Cor 2.12.

39. 2 Cor 6.16.

37. 2 Cor 13.5.

1. 1 Cor 6.11.

4. 1 Cor 12.4-6.

7. 1 Cor 10.22.

10. Hg 2.5.

11. Cf. Jn 14.23; Rv 3.20.

12. Is 11.2.

2. Rom 5.1.

5. 2 Cor 3.18.

8. 1 Tm 4.1.

13. Lk 4.18.

3. 1 Cor 12.3.

6. Eph 4.30.

9. Hg 2.11.

Spirit,”¹⁴ or “The Lord has sent me and his Spirit.”¹⁵ (7) And the manifest voice of the Seraphim, crying, “Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth.”¹⁶ (8) If you hear, “lifted up to the right hand of God, receiving the promise of the Spirit from the Father,”¹⁷ or “to wait for the promise of the Father, which you heard”;¹⁸ or that “the Spirit casts him out into the desert,”¹⁹ or that he says, “Do not worry about what you might say, because the Spirit of my Father is the one speaking in you”;²⁰ or “if in the Spirit of God I cast out demons,”²¹ or “The one blaspheming against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven by him,”²² and what follows; or “Father, into your hands I will commit my Spirit,”²³ or “The child was growing and becoming strong in spirit”;²⁴ or “Jesus, filled with the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan,”²⁵ or “Jesus returned with the power of the Spirit”;²⁶ or “That which has been born from the Spirit is spirit,”²⁷ (is similar to the saying, “What has come to be in him was life”),²⁸ or “and I will entreat the Father, and he will send another advocate to you, the Spirit of truth”;²⁹ or “Because of what did Satan fill your heart (Peter [said] to Ananias), that you cheat the Holy Spirit?”³⁰ and after these things, “You did not cheat men, but God.”³¹ Then God is from God, and God is the Holy Spirit, whom those who set aside the cost of the land for themselves cheated, or “who was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit”³²—I do not have more to say than this. (9) The Son is God: “from whom,” it says, “Christ according to the flesh, the one who is God over all things”;³³ “Believe,” it says, “in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved,” and, “He spoke,” it says, “to them the word of the Lord”;³⁴ “and when he led them into the home, he set before them a table and rejoiced, having believed in God with the entire household,”³⁵ or that “In the beginning was the *Logos*, and the *Logos* was with God, and the *Logos* was God”;³⁶ or “in order that they might adorn the teaching of our Savior

14. Acts 10.38.

17. Acts 2.33.

20. Mt 10.19–20.

23. Lk 23.46.

26. Lk 4.14.

29. Jn 14.16–17.

32. 1 Tm 3.16.

35. Acts 16.34.

15. Is 48.16.

18. Acts 1.4.

21. Mt 12.28.

24. Lk 2.40.

27. Jn 3.6.

30. Acts 5.3.

33. Rom 9.5.

36. Jn 1.1.

16. Is 6.3.

19. Mk 1.12.

22. Mk 3.29.

25. Lk 4.1.

28. Jn 1.3–4.

31. Acts 5.4.

34. Acts 16.31–32.

God,"³⁷ or "For the grace of God and Savior appeared to all men, teaching us",³⁸ or "awaiting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ."³⁹ (10) The service of the Spirit and of the *Logos* is the same. "Give heed," it says, "to yourselves and to the entire flock, in which the Holy Spirit set you as overseers to shepherd the church of God,"⁴⁰ is similar to the saying, "I am grateful to the one strengthening me, to Christ Jesus our Lord, because he deemed me faithful, appointing me to service."⁴¹

CHAPTER SEVENTY

(1) Therefore, the Son and the Holy Spirit, as has been demonstrated, work together with the Father: "for by the word of the Lord the heavens were established and by the breath of his mouth, all their power."¹ The Holy Spirit is to be worshiped: "for it is necessary for those who worship God, to worship in spirit and in truth."² (2) And if he works together these things, a creation does not make a creation, nor does the divinity become created, nor is God known in a limit or circumscription.³ For he is unlimited,⁴ uncontainable,⁵ inconceivable, surpassing all things made of God. (3) Nor is a creation to be worshiped: "for they worshiped the creation in place of the one who created, and they became foolish."⁶ For how is it not foolish to speak of God as a creation and to disregard the first commandment which says, "Hear, Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one";⁷ "There shall not be a new god among you."⁸ (4) In the holy Scriptures different names are called of the Father and Son and

37. Ti 2.10.

40. Acts 20.28.

38. Ti 2.11-12.

41. 1 Tm 1.12.

39. Ti 2.13.

1. Ps 32.6. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.19.1-20.7, 22.1-24.8, 30.4-31.12, on the unified activity of the Trinity.

2. Jn 4.24. Cf. *Anc.* 50.4 for the same argument applied to the Son.3. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 2.13.2-3.4. Cf. Did., *spir.* 21-23.5. Cf. Did., *spir.* 112.6. Rom 1.22, 25. Cf. *Pan.* 69.31.4, 69.36.2.

7. Dt 6.4.

8. Ps 80.10.

Holy Spirit. Of the Father: Father Almighty, Father of All, Father of Christ; and of the Son: *Logos*, Christ, "true Light";⁹ and of the Holy Spirit: "Paraclete,"¹⁰ "Spirit of truth,"¹¹ "Spirit of God,"¹² "Spirit of Christ."¹³ (5) Therefore, [our] God and Father further is thought as "Light,"¹⁴ but as exceedingly bright, "Power," "Wisdom." And if [our] God and Father is "Light," then the Son is "Light from Light," and because of this, "dwelling in unapproachable light."¹⁵ (6) [Our] entire God is "Power," and because of this <the Son> is "Lord of powers";¹⁶ [our] entire God is "Wisdom," therefore the Son is "Wisdom from Wisdom," "in whom all treasures of wisdom are hidden";¹⁷ [our] entire God is "Life," therefore the Son is "Life from Life," "for I am the truth and the life."¹⁸ (7) The Holy Spirit is from both, Spirit from Spirit. "For God is spirit";¹⁹ divinity, he is the giver of gifts, most true, most brilliant, "Paraclete,"²⁰ premonitory of the purposes of the Father. (8) For as the Son is "angel of great counsel,"²¹ thus also is the Holy Spirit. "But we received," it says, "the Spirit of God, in order that we might know that which was given to us by God, which we also speak about, not in the persuasive words of [human] wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit of God, comparing spiritual things to spiritual people."²²

CHAPTER SEVENTY-ONE

(1) But someone will say: "Therefore, we say that there are two sons, and how [then] is he only-begotten?" "No! Who are you, speaking against God?"¹ For if he [the Father] calls the one from him "Son," and the Holy Spirit the one from both, (what alone is by faith being thought by the saints, that he is shining,

9. Jn 1.9.

10. Jn 14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7.

11. Jn 14.17; 15.26; 16.13.

12. Rom 8.9.

13. Ibid.

14. 1 Jn 1.5.

15. 1 Tm 6.16.

16. Ps 58.6.

17. Col 2.3.

18. Jn 14.6.

19. Jn 4.24.

20. Jn 14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7.

21. Is 9.5 LXX.

22. 1 Cor 2.12-13.

1. Rom 9.20. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.15.1-16.7, on the refutation of the same idea; Gr. Naz., *or.* 31.7-9.

illuminating, has illuminating activity, and makes a harmony "of light" with the "Father" himself), (2) by faith listen, O man, because the Father is Father of the true Son, entire light, and <the> Son is <Son> of the true Father, light from light, not in appellation alone, as things which are made or created. And the Holy Spirit is the "Spirit of truth,"² third light from the Father and Son.³ (3) But all the others [sons and spirits] are by adoption and by name, not similar to these in activity or power or light or notion. As someone would say, "I begot sons and raised them up";⁴ or as someone would say, "I myself said, you are gods and all sons of the Most High";⁵ or as someone would say, "the one who has produced drops of rain";⁶ or as someone would say, "from whom all lineages in heaven and on earth";⁷ or as someone would say, "I who strengthen thunder and create wind."⁸ (4) For not like the remaining fathers or patriarchs has the true Father begun to be Father, nor does he abandon at some point in time his existence as Father. For if he begins to be Father, then he was the son at some point in time of another father, before he himself was the Father of the Only-begotten.⁹ As fathers are thought to be children in the likeness of their fathers, it is also an endless thing truly to find the father of this ancient history. (5) Nor like the remaining children, [those] by adoption, is the true Son new at being a son. For if he was new at being Son, there was some point in time when the Father was not Father of the Only-begotten.¹⁰ (6) Neither like the remaining spirits is the "Spirit of truth"¹¹ created or made, nor like the remaining angels is he called "the angel of great counsel."¹²

2. Jn 14.17; 15.26; 16.13.

3. Shapland, *The Letters*, 110, n. 11, sees in Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.19.1-20.7, a resistance to understanding Son as second (and Spirit as third) light in the sun/ray analogy; there is and can only be one light. Here Epiphanius is certainly not implying that the Spirit is a third nature; cf. Bas., *Eun.* 3.1-3.

4. Is 1.2.

5. Ps 81.6.

6. Jb 38.28.

7. Eph 3.15.

8. Am 4.13. Cf. *Pan.* 73.5.1-2. On the importance of Am 4.13, see above, 64 n. 13.

9. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 1.16.1-7; Bas., *Eun.* 2.11-12.

10. Cf. *Pan.* 69.18.1-3; Ath., *Ar.* 2.59; *ep. Serap.* 1.16.1-7.

11. Jn 14.17; 15.26; 16.13.

12. Is 9.5 LXX.

(7) For some have a beginning and an end, but others have both an inconceivable beginning and might; and some create all things for infinite ages, working with the Father, but others are created by these, as they would will. And some worship these [creators], but others are to be worshiped by all created things; some heal that which has been made, but others receive healing from them. And some are judged according to worth, but others have righteous judgment; (8) and some are <in> time, but others happen not to be in time. And some illuminate all things, but other things are illuminated by these; and some call innocents on high, but others are called by the one who is perfect. And some give freely to all, but others receive gifts; and to say once for all, some hymn the Holiness in the heavens of heavens and in the remaining invisible places, but others, being hymned, worthily furnish gifts to those who are worthy.¹³

CHAPTER SEVENTY-TWO

(1) Scripture says there are a great many spirits: "the one who makes spirits his angels [messengers] and a flame of fire his ministers,"¹ and "All you spirits, praise the Lord."² (2) A gift of "discernment of the spirits"³ is given to the worthy. For some [spirits] are heavenly, "rejoicing in the truth," but others are earthly, fit for deceit and error; some are under the earth, children of the abyss and darkness. For the Gospel says, "He was entreating in order that he might not send them to depart into the abyss."⁴ In like manner, he was also commanding the spirits, and he was chasing out spirits with a word and "was not allowing them to speak."⁵ (3) And it is said, "a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning";⁶ and, it is said, a spirit of the world ("We did not receive the spirit of the world," it says)⁷ and a spirit of man, "For who of men knows the things of man, except the spirit of man?"⁸ and "a spirit passing and not turning around."⁹ "Because a spirit

13. Cf. Bas., *Eun.* 3.2.

1. Ps 103.4.

4. Lk 8.31.

7. 1 Cor 2.12.

2. Ps 150.6.

5. Lk 4.41.

8. 1 Cor 2.11.

3. 1 Cor 12.10.

6. Is 4.4.

9. Ps 77.39.

passed through him, and he will be no more,"¹⁰ and "You will take away their spirit, and they will die,"¹¹ and a spirit of prophets. (4) "Spirits of prophets are subject to prophets,"¹² and, "Behold, a lying spirit stood before the Lord, and he [the Lord] said to him, 'With what will you deceive Ahab?' 'And I will be,' it says, 'a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets.'"¹³ (5) And it is said that "a spirit of slumber"¹⁴ is "a spirit of cowardice,"¹⁵ and "a spirit of divination,"¹⁶ and "a spirit of fornication,"¹⁷ and "a spirit of tempest,"¹⁸ and "a spirit of loquaciousness,"¹⁹ and "a spirit of feebleness,"²⁰ and "an unclean spirit,"²¹ and "a mute spirit,"²² and "a speechless spirit,"²³ and "a spirit of impeded speech,"²⁴ and "an exceedingly fierce spirit,"²⁵ which is called Legion,²⁶ and "the spiritual things of wickedness."²⁷ Innumerable are the sayings by the wise concerning the spirits. (6) But just as many sons are by adoption or by a name, but not in truth, because they have a beginning and an end and <were conceived?> sinfully, thus also a great many spirits are by adoption or by a name, and might be sinful. But the Holy Spirit alone is called Spirit of the Father and Son, "Spirit of truth,"²⁸ and "Spirit of God,"²⁹ and "Spirit of Christ,"³⁰ and "Spirit of grace."³¹ (7) For he gives good to each differently, "to one a spirit of wisdom, but to another a spirit of knowledge, to one a spirit of strength, to another a spirit of healings, to one a spirit of prophecy, to another a spirit of discernment, to one of tongues, to another of interpreting,"³² and the remaining gifts, as it says, "and there is one same Spirit allotting to each as he wills."³³ (8) Because "Let your good Spirit lead me,

10. Ps 102.16.

13. 1 Kgs 22.21-22.

16. Acts 16.16.

19. Jb 8.2.

21. Mt 12.43; Mk 1.23; Lk 4.36; 6.18.

22. Mk 7.32; 9.25.

25. Mt 8.28.

28. Jn 14.17; 15.26; 16.13.

29. Rom 8.9.

30. Ibid.

31. Heb 10.29.

32. 1 Cor 12.8-10.

33. 1 Cor 12.11. Did., *spir.* 35-36, emphasized that the Spirit is not a divisible substance, but because of the variety of his activities has received many different names.

11. Ps 103.29.

14. Is 29.10; Rom 11.8.

17. Hos 4.12.

20. Lk 13.11.

23. Mk 9.25.

26. Mk 5.9; Lk 8.30.

12. 1 Cor 14.32.

15. 2 Tm 1.7.

18. Ps 10.6.

24. Mk 7.32.

27. Eph 6.12.

God,"³⁴ David says, or "The spirit blows anywhere it wishes"³⁵ (he is showing to us the enhypostatic [existence] of the Holy Spirit through these things), "and you hear his voice, but you do not know from where he comes and where he goes away."³⁶ And "if you were not born of water and spirit,"³⁷ is similar, as Paul said, "for in Christ Jesus I begot you."³⁸ (9) Concerning this one [the Spirit], the Lord [said], "When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, that one will bear witness concerning me,"³⁹ and, "Still I have many things to say, but you are not able to bear them just now. When that one comes, the Spirit of truth, he will lead you into all truth. For he will not speak from himself, but whatever he will hear, he will speak, and the things to come he will declare to you. That one will glorify me, because he will receive from what is mine and will declare all things to you."⁴⁰

CHAPTER SEVENTY-THREE

(1) If, therefore, "he proceeds from the Father"¹ and "will receive from what is mine,"² the Lord says, just as, "no one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father,"³ thus I dare to say that [no one knows] Spirit except the Son from whom he receives and the Father from whom he proceeds. (2) And [no one knows] the Son and the Father, except the Holy Spirit, the one who truly glorifies, the one who teaches all things, the one who bears witness concerning the Son, who is from the Father, who is of the Son, the only guide of truth, expounder of holy laws, instructor of the spiritual law, professor of the prophets, teacher of the apostles, illuminator of the Gospel doctrines, selector of the saints, true light from true light.⁴ (3) The Son is a real Son, true Son, genuine Son, the unique one from the unique one, and the Spirit is with him, <not a Son> but being named "Spirit." (4) This one is the God who is glorified in the church: always the Father, always the Son, and

34. Ps 142.10.

37. Jn 3.5.

40. Jn 16.12-14.

35. Jn 3.8.

38. 1 Cor 4.15.

36. Ibid.

39. Jn 15.26.

1. Jn 15.26.

4. Cf. *Anc.* 11.3.

2. Jn 16.14.

3. Mt 11.27.

always the Holy Spirit, sublime of sublime and highest, intellectual,⁵ having immeasurable glory, to whom [all] things created and made are inferior, in general everything that is circumscribed and each thing that is encompassed. (5) The divinity is especially declared as one in the Law of Moses, and is very much proclaimed as two in the Prophets, and is made known as three in the Gospels, furnishing more for the knowledge and faith of the righteous person, according to seasons and generations.⁶ Knowledge of it [divinity] is immortality, and adoption as a son comes to be from faith in it [divinity]. (6) But first it [knowledge] recounts the ordinances of the flesh, as though raising up externally the encircling wall of the temple in the Mosaic Law. But next it describes in detail the ordinances of the soul, as though adorning the holy things in the remaining prophecies. And thirdly, [it describes] the ordinances of the spirit, as though arranging the Mercy-seat and Holy of Holies in the Gospels for its dwelling: a holy tabernacle, holy temple, <which> holds only the righteous person who is joined with these. (7) And the one infinite divinity dwells in it, one incorruptible divinity, one inconceivable divinity, incomprehensible, indescribable, invisible, the only one knowing itself, manifesting itself to those it wills, raising up witnesses for itself, calling, predestining, glorifying, lifting out of Hades, sanctifying, (8) unifying again, for its glory and faith, these three things: heavenly things, earthly things, and under earthly things; spirit, soul, flesh; faith, hope, love; things past, things present, things future; age of age, ages of ages, Sabbaths of Sabbaths; circumcision of the flesh, circumcision of the heart, "circumcision of Christ in the putting off of the body of sins."⁷ (9) It completely makes pure all things for itself, invisible and visible things, thrones, dominions, rulers, authorities, powers.⁸ Overall the same holy voice, from glory to glory uttering, "Holy, holy, holy," <glorifying> Father in Son, the Son in Father, with the Holy Spirit, to whom is the

5. "intellectual" = νοερός.

6. Cf. Gr. Naz., *or.* 31.26, on the progressive revelation from Old Testament to New.

7. Col 2.11.

8. Cf. Col 1.16.

glory and the might into the ages of ages, Amen!⁹ And the one who thus believes will say, "So be it, so be it!"

CHAPTER SEVENTY-FOUR

(1) And concerning the Trinity and consubstantiality¹ of God the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, we who are weak and unskilled, using no sophisticated arguments² nor opposing them "with the trickery of men,"³ but rather gathering together testimonies from the divine Scriptures, for those wishing for the discovery of the faithful and the refutation of wicked believers and vainglorious men, [we] have collected a portion [of the testimonies]. For great is the power of faith in the Holy Spirit, which has been proclaimed excellently in all the divine Scriptures. (2) Since the assurance of our salvation is the assured confession of the Incarnation and the incarnate *parousia* of our Savior, and the confirmation of hope, both concerning the resurrection of the dead and our rebirth, adding again a little to this, our labor, for those wishing to read something more accurate, collecting from the same divine Scriptures and adding to our argument, we continue. (3) For since, as we already were taught in what has been written before, our Lord himself in his Gospel said to his disciples, "going forth, baptize all the nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe the commandments which I commanded you."⁴ He is the holy *Logos*, the one who is enhypostatic, the one who came forth from the Father, through whom the ages have come to be, through whom the times and seasons [have come to be]. For there was not a season nor a time before the Son. (4) For if there was time before the Son, then time is greater than the Son; and how is it that "through him all things came to be, and apart from him nothing came to be which has come

9. Cf. 1 Pt 4.11. Cf. *Anc.* 10.1-4, 22.7, 26.1-3.

1. The word is ὁμοουσιότητος, which I have translated here.

2. For parallel sentiments against sophistry, see *Pan.* 77.1.6, 77.24.7-8, 77.30.5.

3. Eph 4.14.

4. Mt 28.19.

to be"?⁵ Because if something has come to be, it has come to be through him; and he is uncreated and always exists: because the Father always was, and his Holy Spirit always was. (5) For if there was time before the Son, then in turn <another> will be sought through whom also was the time before the Son, and then countless things will turn our reasoning to an illusion, lurking in the opinion of men, or rather to a fornication of thoughts, and not <to that which?> concerns soundness of mind. (6) Therefore, there was not a time before the Son, since the Son has not come to be through time. But through the Son, times and the angels and all other created things [have come to be]. There was not ever a time when the Son was not, nor was there ever [a time] when the Spirit was not.⁶

CHAPTER SEVENTY-FIVE

(1) Some people are accustomed, deciding wrongly and not thinking, to differentiate the reading in the saying, "All things came to be through him, and apart from him nothing came to be,"¹ while thus setting aside the literal meaning, to accept an opinion of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. They err concerning the reading, and from the error of reading they stumble, being turned toward blasphemy.² (2) Thus the reading has: "All things came to be through him, and apart from him nothing came to be, that which has come to be in him,"³ that is to say that if something has come to be, it came to be through him.⁴ (3) Therefore, the Father always was, and the Son always was; and the Spirit breathes forth from Father and Son, and neither is the Son created nor is the Spirit created.⁵ But after Father and Son and Holy Spirit all things, created and originated, not

5. Jn 1.3.

6. Cf. *Pan.* 69.25.4-5.

1. Jn 1.3.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 69.56.1-2. See DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind," 652-53, for how both authors interpreted Jn 1.3 in connection with Am 4.13 to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

3. Jn 1.3-4.

4. Cf. *Pan.* 69.18.4-6; *Bas., Eun.* 3.7; *Gr. Naz., or.* 31.12.

5. Cf. *Ath., tom.* 3; *Bas., ep.* 125.

existing at some point in time, came to be from Father and Son and Holy Spirit, through the *Logos* who always exists, with the Spirit, who always exists.⁶ (4) Therefore, through the *Logos* himself all created things have come to be, [through] the heavenly king, the enhypostatic *Logos*, our Savior and benefactor. (5) For he is the holy Savior, the one who came down from heaven, the one who deemed worthy that our salvation be accomplished in a virgin womb, the one who has been born in turn from Mary, conceived through the Holy Spirit, the one who assumed the flesh, the *Logos* who became flesh, the one who did not change his nature, the one who with his divinity assumed humanity, the one who is perfect from the Father, the one who fulfilled the perfect economy, came into the world for us and for our salvation. (6) [He is] the one who assumed the flesh and the human soul, being perfect from the Father, who became incarnate among us not in appearance, but in truth, who perfectly formed for himself a man from Mary, *Theotokos*, through the Holy Spirit. (7) [He is the one] who did not dwell in a man, as it has been accustomed in the prophets to say that he dwells and acts in power, but the *Logos* himself who became flesh, who did not alter his being as God, who did not change the divinity into humanity, but with his own fullness of his divinity and with his own *hypostasis* of God-*Logos* and enhypostatic, assumed existence as a man and as much as is man.⁷ (8) I say perfect man as <having> however much is in a man and whatever sort a man is. The Only-begotten came and assumed this, in order that in the perfect man, being God, he might work perfectly the whole of salvation, having omitting nothing of man, in order that any omitted part in turn might not become fodder for the Devil.

6. Cf. Ath., *ep. Serap.* 2.13.4–14.1, on the Spirit as Creator, just as the Son, and Ath., *Ar.* 1.13, on the eternity of the Son.

7. Cf. Pan. 77.33.6. Again “enhypostatic” = ἐνυπόστατος, which Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 278–79, suggests this implies “really existing,” especially as a contrast to Apollinarian thinking, which according to Epiphanius called the νοῦς a *hypostasis*. See Richard, “L’Introduction,” 5–32, 243–70, but especially 9–12 on Epiphanius.

CHAPTER SEVENTY-SIX

(1) And if some people say that he has assumed only flesh, and not a soul, weaving myths and turning the Scripture into myths from the saying, "We have the mind of Christ";¹ from the very saying let them understand that the ones who say, "We have the mind of Christ"² were possessing their own mind and did not abominate this.³ But if they had their own [mind] along with the mind of Christ, they were being filled full of both: on the one hand the mind of Christ, which is able to bring improvement, on the other hand their own [mind], which thinks rightly.⁴ (2) And let them think also the same thing about Christ, that being God and a mind being in him, he had the mind of man, <if indeed?> he assumed a soul along with the flesh. (3) Not therefore as a man was he altering it, but he was becoming adorning of the mind, and corrector and improver. For as he assumed the flesh, not having been defeated by flesh, thus also having assumed the mind, he has not been defeated by a mind. (4) Therefore, contrarily and more greatly such men seriously fall into error. For from end to end the divine Scriptures expressly cry aloud, not declaring harsh things against the mind, but against the flesh. (5) "For of the flesh," it says, "the fruits are fornication, adultery, licentiousness, and things similar to these,"⁵ and, "Those who are in the flesh are not able to please God."⁶ And, "The flesh desires against the spirit."⁷ But concerning the mind it says that "I will sing with my spirit, and I will sing also with my mind,"⁸ and that "my mind is barren or fruitful."⁹ (6) For God established the

1. 1 Cor 2.16.

2. Ibid.

3. Cf. *Pan.* 77.33.5-35.2. For the identification of the "some people" in this section, as well as in *Anc.* 33 and 77, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 280-83.

4. Cf. *Pan.* 77.34.1-6. Epiphanius rejected the idea that the mind is a *hypostasis*. Instead, it is a type of *energeia*, and so to have the "mind of Christ" was to have a divinely apportioned understanding, and hence a person could possess the human mind and the "mind of Christ." In a parallel way, Christ could also possess a human mind.

5. Gal 5.19-21.

6. Rom 8.8.

7. Gal 5.17.

8. 1 Cor 14.15.

9. 1 Cor 14.14. Cf. *Pan.* 77.24.1-2.

mind, which the Scripture has been accustomed to call "heart," "guide" as it says, and driver of the entire vessel, discerner of the good and the bad, scrutinizer of the things springing up in us. "For the mind discerns statements, but the palate tastes food."¹⁰ The mind in man is discerning, but not yet assenting, if it does not give itself to change.

CHAPTER SEVENTY-SEVEN

(1) So why did it seem good to some people to cast this [the mind] aside from the Incarnation of the Lord? And how did they help life, turning <the truth?> rather into confusion? Or what is this that hindered us or helped us, in order that thus I might say how they assisted Christ? Can it be that in order that they might make this grace great for him, they even say <about> him <that> he did not assume a mind?¹ (2) "For Galatians are foolish,"² and "Cretans are always liars,"³ and "Ephraim is a foolish dove."⁴ Our Lord, who became incarnate, has received all things completely in life, but rather he himself assumed [all things], having become shaper of his own body, he who assumed for himself the soul or put it on.⁵ (3) Some people, wishing to make lacking the incarnate *parousia* of Christ and the perfect economy in him, I do not know why they, who do not think rightly, said that Christ has not assumed a mind. (4) But not because of <sinful thinking?> do they appear to <cast away?> the mind. For these men

10. Jb 12.11.

1. Cf. *Pan.* 77.24.3-5, 77.25.1, for similar expressions of concern about how these speculations (do not) benefit the church. Although Epiphanius was not explicit about who the propagators of such teachings were, the opponents seem to be Apollinarius or at least those of his school of thinking. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 282-83, emphasized the deliberate anonymity of the heretical opponent here, though by contrast with the explicit naming in *Anc.* 13.8.

2. Gal 3.1.

3. Ti 1.12.

4. Hos 7.11.

5. This expression is also found in a fragment of a letter written by Epiphanius to a certain Magnus, a presbyter of Antioch, whom he accused of being a "Sabellian" heretic. Of course, as in the context here, Epiphanius used the accusation of Sabellianism against Apollinarian doctrine. See Lebon, "Sur quelques fragments," 155-57.

believe that the mind is a *hypostasis*, and naturally they dare to say that <it is> the usual thing being said in Scripture, the spirit in man, as the Apostle [Paul] says, "in order that your spirit and soul and body might be kept complete on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."⁶ (5) So they err: for if a mind is the spirit and the spirit a mind, as they also believe, but the soul is another <*hypostasis*> along with the mind and along with the spirit, no longer are two *hypostaseis* being combined into a man into one *hypostasis*, no longer is the soul alone enhypostatic and the body enhypostatic, but we find then four: the mind is one *hypostasis*, the soul another *hypostasis*, the spirit another *hypostasis*, the body another *hypostasis*.⁷ (6) And if we search again, there will still be more: for since man has acquired many names, both "the inside man"⁸ and "the outside man,"⁹ and Scripture has said all these things in a mystical sense,¹⁰ binding together our thinking, in order that we might leave behind nothing from salvation nor that there might be an excuse for us for departing from what has been set forth. For these things are in man, and it is not necessary to inquire closely into them. (7) Nevertheless, against the argument of those people, if the mind is the spirit, and the spirit the mind, and these things exist outside of the soul, again why does it say in Scripture, "I will sing with my spirit; I will sing also with my mind"?¹¹ For through this it demonstrated that the spirit is not the mind, nor the mind the spirit.

CHAPTER SEVENTY-EIGHT

(1) Then again, "the soul which sins is the very one which will die"¹ declared that it [the soul] is not outside of the body. "For there were," it says, "in the ship seventy souls," and in no

6. 1 Thes 5.23. Cf. *Pan.* 77.23.4-24.2. See also Richard, "L' Introduction," 9-12, for discussion of Epiphanius's presentation of Apollinarian incarnational theology.

7. Cf. *Pan.* 77.23.3-6.

8. Rom 7.22.

9. 2 Cor 4.16.

10. "mystical sense" = νοηματικῶς. See 90 n. 16, above.

11. 1 Cor 14.15.

1. Ezek 18.4.

way were there souls without a body, but bodies with souls.² And again it has been the custom to call [a person] "man" from the one name ["soul"], because there is a master of eighty bodies, in no way without souls. (2) Therefore, the *Logos*, who became flesh, <did not happen to be> without a soul, <as> also he was not without all [human] affairs. For when it says "soul," it did not declare it without a body; nor when we say bodies, do we think they are without a soul. (3) So why did it seem a good thing for those who wish to say that the mind has been cast aside? Or for what did this help the church? Or what rather did it not disturb? And how is the one who thinks such things not making our salvation lacking? (4) For we are not able to think that the mind is another thing, nor are we able to say this [the mind] is a *hypostasis* in and of itself. But it is a composite and rational and thinking thing in each of those who are <not> mad, that is to say, it is the thought of man: as eyes are in the body, thus is a mind in a soul. And again we do not assert this argumentatively, but simply that it is the mental [aspect] of men. (5) So what is a man? Soul, body, mind, and as much as there is any other thing.³ Therefore, what did the Lord come to save? Surely a complete man. So, then, he assumed all things in himself completely. (6) Whence otherwise could these things have been fulfilled in him, which were prophesied and were equivalent in a man, from mind and body and soul and the whole Incarnation, without sin? (7) For wisely the divine Word instructs us, saying, "Behold, my beloved child will understand, whom I chose, in whom my soul was well pleased; I will set <upon him> my Spirit,"⁴ and what follows.⁵ Then, at any rate, where has the understanding been fulfilled? If on the one hand in the divinity, then is the divinity lacking in understanding? "By no means!"⁶ For this is fulfilled in the Lord's-man.⁷ And if it has been fulfilled in the Lord's-man, how will an Incarnation, existing with-

2. Acts 27.37. Cf. *Anc.* 59.2-3.

3. Cf. *Pan.* 77.27.2-3.

4. Is 42.1; 52.13 LXX; Mt 12.18.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 77.26.3-7, 77.30.1-5.

6. Rom 6.2.

7. On the concept of "Lord's-man," see 110 n. 2, above.

out a mind, understand? This is impossible. (8) For if "he will understand" actually refers to Christ, and Christ is God-*Logos* on high, but who became flesh from Mary, and who became incarnate and "lived among us,"⁸ according to what has been written, then unambiguously, with the mind, he accepted the economy, since understanding befits it [the economy]. (9) For because of this, concerning him the Gospel says, "he was advancing in wisdom and age."⁹ The divinity was not admitting age nor lacking wisdom, being complete wisdom. The Incarnation of the Savior was advancing in wisdom, not without a mind present, since <otherwise> he was not able to grow wise. And he was advancing in age as a maturing child, as is true.

CHAPTER SEVENTY-NINE

(1) But if because of the assumption of the mind, sin itself is thought [to be assumed], then it is more remarkable, if we grant that he assumed flesh, without which sin is not accomplished: "for the works of the flesh are manifest,"¹ especially because we might grant it, that he also sinned in the flesh, having assumed the flesh. "For I know," the Apostle [Paul] says, "that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh."² (2) But who will dare to say, on account of the Savior assuming flesh, that he has been led astray by the flesh, and that he accomplished the things of the flesh which are not rational, in the ordering of all of his own vessel, similarly <good> and bad, and yet that he has possessed flesh which is human, but <in> no way stumbling. (3) For the God-*Logos* who came forth from on high from the Father, who consented to come to be in flesh, was guiding his vessel; and if he was wishing to check it from all useless, fleshly action, he was able. And if he was wishing, he was allowing it. But he was allowing it in the bodily uses that were rational and befitting to his divinity. (4) For truly possessing the mind, just as he truly was possessing the entire Incarnation, [the mind]

8. Jn 1.14.

9. Lk 2.52. Cf. *Anc.* 31.7, 38.1, 40.2, 40.6.

1. Gal 5.19.

2. Rom 7.18.

was not being directed toward irrational desires, nor was he doing or reckoning the things of the flesh as we do. But as God, who came to be in true flesh from the Virgin Mary, he was acting with flesh and with soul and with mind and with the entire vessel, he who dwelt with the race of men, from on high, from the Father, enhypostatic God-*Logos*. (5) But let not some people play tricks with this which is said analogically, as [the phrase] "hear my cry."³ For it has been said analogically on account of it being a prayer, and it is clear <that> the use was prophesied <for the> analogy of his fleshly *parousia*. And the [phrase] "he was advancing in age" is true.⁴

CHAPTER EIGHTY

(1) But why are such people accustomed to say: If we say that Christ has become a complete human from Mary or has possessed <a mind>, do we not suppose that he fell under sin? "By no means!"¹ "For he did not commit a sin, nor was deceit found in his mouth."² (2) For if he breathed his power on the saints, and those on whom he breathed bear witness that they were holy, just, having advanced in their days blameless,³ by how much more at any rate was the *Logos* himself, "in whom all the fullness of the divinity was pleased to dwell bodily,"⁴ (and if he assumed true flesh from Mary, the perpetual virgin, and truly a human soul and a mind, and if something else is in a man), holding all things in himself, being God, [but] not possessing things being apportioned to evil, things corrupted from wickedness, things being taken into carnal pleasure, things falling under the transgression of Adam? (3) And because of this the Apostle [Paul] says, "came to be from a woman, came to be under law,"⁵ and again "found in form as a man."⁶ And "in form," <and "as a man,"> and "came to be," and "under law," by drawing together both [texts], it indicates completeness and

3. Ps 5.2.

4. Lk 2.52. Cf. *Pan.* 77.26.4-27.9, for the argument that the assumption of either the mind or the flesh did not necessitate the assumption of human sin.

1. Rom 6.2.

2. 1 Pt 2.22; cf. Is 53.9.

3. Cf. Lk 1.6.

4. Col 2.9.

5. Gal 4.4.

6. Phil 2.7.

impassibility; from "came to be," [it indicates] being complete, and <from> "under law," [it indicates] not being [a man] in appearance, and <from> "in form," [it indicates] the certainty of his likeness, and from "as a man," [it indicates] blamelessness.

(4) Therefore, with these things being thus, let no one be deceived by empty myths. For if he who was begotten above truly from the Father was also born from Mary, and he both speaks truth above and speaks truth below; and if he is imperfect below, he is also imperfect above. But if he is perfect above, he is also perfect below.⁷ He did not dwell in another perfect [man], but he perfected all things in himself. (5) And he rose from the dead, no longer being separated in the tomb into body and divinity and soul in the nether parts, no longer falling subject to [human] contact, no longer being kept in check, but entering doors which have been closed, being touched by Thomas, in order that he might not be likened to an apparition, but in truth. (6) The one who was believed by Thomas after the fulfillment of that which has been said before, "with my hands I sought out God, and I was not deceived,"⁸ is the same God, the same man, the one who did not produce a mixture, but who united the two into one. (7) Not having come to annihilation, but having infused [both] with equal power, he united the earthly body with divinity into one power. Into one divinity he brought [them] together.⁹ He is one Lord, one Christ, not two Christs nor two Gods.¹⁰ (8) In him the body is spiritual; in him the divinity is incomprehensible, the one [body] which has suffered but did not become corrupt, the one which is impassible, incorruptible; the whole is incorruption. He is Lord God, who sits at the right hand of the Father, who did not leave aside the flesh, but who united the whole into one, and into one divinity, who sits at the right hand of the Father.¹¹

7. Cf. *Pan.* 69.25.9.

8. *Ps* 76.3.

9. Cf. *Pan.* 78.24.6, which itself is the closing remarks of a letter Epiphanius had written to Christians in Arabia against the so-called Antidicomarians.

10. Cf. *Anc.* 119.7; *Pan.* 77.29.5. This was a charge made by both Eunomius and Apollinarius; see Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 435-45, on Gregory of Nyssa's refutation.

11. As Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 296, remarks, strikingly absent in this entire discussion is the use of *φύσις* as a term to discuss the Incarnation.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-ONE

(1) So this is the Only-begotten, the perfect one, the uncreated one, the unchanging one, the invariable one, the inconceivable one, the invisible one, <the> one who became incarnate among us and who rose spiritually and "no longer dies,"¹ no longer being destitute, the one "who, being rich, on our account became destitute,"² the whole one who is spirit, the one who unites the fleshly and the divine, one Lord, King, Christ, the Son of God, who in heaven is seated at the right hand of the Father "above all rule and authority, power and every name that is being named."³ It says in the Gospel, "going forth, baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."⁴ (2) And this "and" which is in the middle was indicating that the Son is not a coalescence with the Father. But he knows the Father, true Father; and he demonstrated himself to be a true enhypostatic *Logos* and that his Holy Spirit is an enhypostatic Spirit and "Spirit of truth,"⁵ uncreated,⁶ unchanging,⁷ invariable. (3) It cannot be that someone might suppose craftily, bearing against the faith and its "feet," hiding and practicing cunning against the truth ("for God tests the heart and kidneys").⁸ (4) And the heretic says: "Clearly I believe that the Father is Father, and the Son is Son, and the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit, and I confess three *hypostaseis* in one *ousia*. I say not another *ousia* besides the divinity, not another divinity besides the *ousia*." But for the sake of being accurate we call it <one> *ousia*, in order that we might not say one and then another form of the divinity of the Trinity.⁹ (5) For, as I said, such a one who

1. Cf. Rom 6.9.

2. 2 Cor 8.9.

3. Eph 1.21.

4. Mt 28.19. Cf. *Anc.* 19.1-6 for a parallel list of names and attributes of Christ.

5. Jn 14.17; 15.26; 16.13.

6. Cf. Did., *spir.* 54.

7. Cf. Did., *spir.* 16, 56-59.

8. Ps 7.10.

9. Cf. *Anc.* 6.10. See especially Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 300-303, on the difficulty of translating these "heretical" expressions, as well as the challenge of determining where the heretic stops speaking and where Epiphanius was express-

conceals craftily again also says cunningly: "I believe that the Father is Father; Son is Son; Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit." But he holds to such a hidden opinion, that from us [humans] having compared the divinity, he says in himself, that as I have a human body and soul and spirit, thus also does the divinity. (6) On the one hand the Father is as the saying "form," on the other hand the Son, as a soul in man, and the Spirit just as the breath through man. For some people practice cunning and believe thus about the divinity.¹⁰ (7) But we did not learn thus. But behold, the Father in heaven bears witness through his voice; behold the Son in the Jordan; behold the Holy Spirit, who descends in the form of a dove, assumed the likeness. But in accordance with himself did he assume the likeness, in accordance with himself being a *hypostasis*, not a different kind besides that of the Father and Son, but of the same *ousia*, *hypostasis* from the same *hypostasis* of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. (8) Again in another way: behold the Father is seated in heaven. But again do not assume "seated" in a human way, but understand it indescribably and incomprehensibly. And it did not say the Son went up to the Father, but "he sat down at the right hand of the Father."¹¹ (9) And again concerning the Holy Spirit, the Only-begotten taught, saying, "I depart, and that one will come, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth. And if I do not go, that one does not come."¹² And if the Spirit were a coalescence with the Son himself, he would not be saying, "I depart, and that one will come," but in order that he might demonstrate a *hypostasis* and a *hypostasis*. But the divinity is one, one God, one truth.¹³

ing his own view (here I follow his suggestion). Here we also have what seems to be Epiphanius's rejection of the three-*hypostaseis* formula which would later become characteristic of the "pro-Nicene" ("Neo-Nicene") definition and would subsequently be adopted by Epiphanius in the *Panarion* (for example, 25.6.4).

10. Cf. *Pan.* 62.1.4-5, in the refutation against Sabellianism, which has a parallel in *Ps.-Ath., Sabell.* 12-13. See Hübner, "Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Ps.-Athanasius," 328-29. Epiphanius seemed to imply here that the unnamed heretic asserted three gradations within the one divinity, as the body, soul, and spirit comprise a human being.

11. Heb 10.12.

12. Jn 16.7.

13. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 303-6, 348-70, discusses the apparent shifts in

CHAPTER EIGHTY-TWO

(1) And thus I have written for the one who wishes <to know?> the ordering of our life and steadfast confession, that which has been preserved without defilement in the catholic church, from the law and the prophets and Gospels and apostles, and from the times of the apostles until our own times. (2) But against a malice of confusion of the one and true faith, season after season, because of the heresies, [I have written concerning] our same faith (and hope and salvation) which was persecuted, but abided in its truth, while the heresies of each age defiled themselves and were estranged from the church.¹ (3) As even as recently again we hear of some people who appear to bring back the main issues, by some of the ascetics in Egypt and of the Thebaid and elsewhere of other regions, who think things similar to the Hieracites and speak of the resurrection of our flesh, but not [really] of this [flesh], but of another instead of it, as such people were diverted and diverted the truth of God and our steadfast hope into myths.² And on which account we are compelled to speak again concerning this.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-THREE

(1) For unbelievers deny the entirety of the resurrection, and wicked believers vulgarly and foolishly have fallen from the true hope to thinking thus about the resurrection. (2) And *Hellenes*¹ are the ones who completely deny the resurrection because of the impiety of the multitude of transgressions which come to be among them. For they hate the resurrection on

Epiphanius's usage of the terms *hypostasis* and *ousia*, especially in comparison to *Anc.* 6.5, where he emphasized one *hypostasis* in the context of *homoousios*. Here in *Anc.* 81 Epiphanius seems to have moved closer to the notion of three *hypostaseis* and one *ousia*, though he was apparently careful in his use of the singular and the plural of *hypostasis*. He put into the mouth of the "heretic" in *Anc.* 81.4 the plural, whereas in his subsequent uses maintained the singular. Compare this with his usage in *Pan.* 72.1.3, 73.34.2, 78.24.5 (all in plural).

1. This section is clearly transitional, moving from Trinitarian theology to the bodily resurrection.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 67 on the Hieracites.

account of which they are destined to be subjected to shame in the resurrection, having being ignorant about God and his commandments. Except that they will rise, even if they do not wish. (3) For creation itself expressly refutes them, intimating each day the form of resurrection. For the day falls, and we signify obscurely the way of the dead, a slumber of the night which is signified obscurely. The day appears over the horizon, awakening us and demonstrating the sign of a resurrection. (4) Fruits are plucked, and the point where they were is cut away; hence [this is a sign] of our departure, when our person is separated. The earth is sown and buds grow, because that which has been buried will rise after the cutting. A locust may die, having buried that which is conceived, cast off from it, into the earth, and after a season the earth returns the things which were buried there. The seeds of produce are sown and first "die," then they bear fruit. "For if it does not die, it does not give life."² (5) God made a seal of the resurrection in us through twenty [finger and toe] nails, which bear witness concerning our hope. But also as through the crown of hair upon the head, he proclaimed our resurrection. For the body seeming dead in us, that is our hair and nails, each being clipped and cut, grow back again, indicating the hope of resurrection.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-FOUR

(1) And there are unspeakably many things to say from analogies against the confidence of the unbelievers. But the dove, a bird, did not persuade these men, nor the dormouse, an animal.¹ For such as this [animal] dies in the sixth month and the

1. The term is "Ἐλλήνες."

2. 1 Cor 15.36.

1. The reference to the dormouse is uncertain. In *Pan.* 64.72.6-7, however, Epiphanius explained how naturalists say that the dormouse is common prey for vipers. A dormouse will bear five or more offspring, and, if a viper finds them, the snake will eat one or two, then blind the rest, feed them, and eat them at its leisure. Perhaps Epiphanius here is inferring that heretics are blinded and consumed by their false beliefs. We can find one specific reference in Oppian, *Cynegetica* 2.574, which described the hibernation of dormice. Oppian, probably from Apamea, was a second-century CE naturalist and didactic poet. In *Pan.* Proem 2.3.1, Epiphanius listed several naturalists (though not Oppian)

bird in forty days, and according to their season come to life again. (2) Dung-beetles that are about to die hide themselves in a ball of dung, having buried such a ball in the earth and having covered it. And thus out of their secretion they are found, rising again from their remains. (3) Concerning the phoenix, the Arabian bird, there is too much for me to say. For already it has come in a story for both many faithful people and unbelievers. And such a subject comes to light of its own accord. Living five hundred years, when it should know that the season of its end is at hand, it makes a nest of sweet herbs and, carrying it, goes to the city of the Egyptians, thus called Heliopolis, but is translated as "On" in the Egyptian and the Hebrew dialect. (4) And with its wings, having beaten its own breast many times, bringing forth fire from its body it sets afire the underlying wood in this way. And thus it would offer itself as a sacrifice, and it burns to ashes all its flesh with its bones. (5) Out of the economy of God, a cloud is sent, and it rains and puts out the flame that consumed the body of the bird, after the bird is already dead and utterly scorched. (6) From the quenched fire the remains of its flesh, still coarse, remain, and in about one day that which was destroyed produces a worm. The worm grows feathers, becoming a young bird, and in three days matures. And having come to maturity, it manifests itself to those assisting in that place and again travels to its own homeland and rests.²

CHAPTER EIGHTY-FIVE

(1) It occurs to me to wonder about the mistaken thinking concerning all things of the unbelieving *Hellenes* and other bar-

from whom he conceivably could have derived some of his knowledge on the different animals with which he makes comparisons to various heresiarchs and heretics. J. Dummer, "Ein naturwissenschaftliches Handbuch als Quelle für Epiphanius von Constantia," *Klio* 55 (1973): 289-99, suggests that Epiphanius's information on venomous animals and pharmacological cures was taken from an intermediary source whose author is unknown.

2. The comparison between the legendary phoenix and the resurrection was common among ancient Christian thinkers. Cf. Clement of Rome, *ad Corinthios epistulae* 25; Or., *contra Celsum* 4.98; Pseudo-Lactantius, *Carmen de aue Phoenixe*; Cyr. H., *catech.* 18.8; *constitutiones apostolicae* 5.7.15; Ambrose, *De excessu fratris sui Satyri* 2.59, *Hexameron libri sex* 5.23.

barians against all things, as in their myths they are not ashamed to indicate the resurrection in every way and to sing often concerning the resurrection, (2) as when their myths describe Alkestis, the daughter of Pelios, who died for her husband Admetos and has been raised by Heracles after three days and has been brought back up from places not to be entered. [They describe:] Pelops, the son of Tantalos, after the serving of his flesh by his own father to their falsely-named "gods"; (3) Amphiareos, <the> son of Oikles, who was restored to life by Asklepios; Glaukos, the son of Minos, who was made alive again with a certain herb by Polyeidios the son of Koiranos; Castor on account of his brother Polydeukes, who willingly chose to exchange his life with him [Castor] every other day; and Protesilaos, on account of Laodameia. (4) But [they describe] also Sisypheos and Tantalos and the daughters of Kaukasos, who have been called Erinnyes, and Teiresias, at the same time as these, hurled down to Tartaros, going to pay justice there, one on the rock and the other under a wheel, and others have been punished in other ways and still remain in punishment, as they have not been given to annihilation, but continue to exist in the body. (5) For if they were not possessing bodies, how were they given over to punishment by a rock and a wheel? And there are many things to say concerning these things for the demonstration of the faith in us and the refutation against them.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-SIX

(1) But also those who originate from the heresies sing about things akin to these and things in unison with unbelief, in that some of the heretics, the Manichaeans, say that there will be a resurrection not of the body, but of the soul, and in like manner also the aforementioned *Hellenes* believe and join in approving the same thing, since their argument is silly, more so being put forward from their understanding.¹ (2) For if the heresies speak on the resurrection and actually believe in a resurrection,

1. On Epiphanius's attack on the Manichaean view of the resurrection, see *Pan.* 66.86.1-87.8.

they limit this with respect to souls. Such as this is absurd. For how will the soul, which has not fallen, be raised up? For we do not bury souls in tombs, but bodies. (3) For souls do not fall, but flesh, as also has been the custom to call dead bodies "fallen." Therefore, if a resurrection is confessed by them, in every point it is clear <that> it is not of a soul, but of a body that has fallen. (4) But the *Hellenes* again are refuted, they who deny the entirety of the resurrection. Bringing forth food and drink to tombs on the days which are called "common," they offer meats and pour wine libations, benefiting not at all the dead, but rather harming themselves. (5) They are, however, compelled from custom to confess the resurrection of the dead. For they attend to the bodies placed there of those who died, and they address the buried dead by name. "Rise," they say, "O So-and-So, eat and drink and enjoy yourself." (6) And if thither they believe that the souls endure where the remains of those who died have been buried, there is an expectation for some such good for the souls. For they endure [until] the future day and the resurrection of rebirth, until they receive their compounded and united bodies, even if the children of the *Hellenes* abhor the flesh as being bad and completely destroyed and not having hope of living again. (7) And if they do not do this in this way, binding fast with some argument the better souls with a condemnation of the *ousia* of the bodies, rather do they throw about the notion, limiting them [the souls] to wait with the dead remains? Or for what sort of expectation of hope do they stand by, let them say! (8) But it is clear that they do not believe that the souls are in a tomb, but in some storehouses of God which have been set aside for each soul, according to the worth of what they accomplished and governed in life. The bodies were laid down with their own hands, each in a coffin for bodies or ossuaries. It would be silly that there be the one notion and ordering for all of these people, as has been confessed on all sides, but for the unbelievers, that contrariwise the true things are utterly denied and the possibilities to be hoped for in God have not been affirmed among them.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-SEVEN

(1) But concerning these things I believe that sufficient things have been said, since we have provided a few things from the many illustrations. (2) And concerning those who appear to be Christians, (but being persuaded by Origen and confessing the resurrection of the dead, both of our flesh and of the body of the Lord, that holy one which has been received from Mary, and saying that this flesh is not raised, but another in place of this is given from God), how rather would we not say of them that they have a more impious notion and a heresy more foolish than the opinion among the *Hellenes* and the rest? (3) For first, if another [flesh] in place of this is raised according to their argument, the judgment of God is not just, according to their myth, judging another flesh in place of the one that sinned or bearing another body for the glory of the royal inheritance of heaven in place of the body that has toiled with fasts and sleeplessness and mortifications in the name of God.¹ (4) Also, how will the soul alone be judged according to the argument of the heresies, if the body that has sinned together [with it] is not present? For such a soul, when it says that the sins have come to be of the body, would contradict the judgment of God. (5) For there is even "proof" with respect to the argument of those who are carried away with contentiousness and not with truth. For [the soul] it is able to say: "I did not sin, but the body [did]. For since I came out of the body, neither did I fornicate nor commit adultery, nor did I steal nor murder nor commit idolatry; I did not do anything evil and fatal."² (6) And its defense will be found reasonable. And when [the soul] speaks reasonably in defense, what will we say? Is the judgment of God then undone? But "does God inflict his wrath unjustly against men? By no means!"³

1. Cf. *Pan.* 64.71.6-8. Here the ascetic concerns of Epiphanius and the essential connection to the real body are clear.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 64.71.12, though here Epiphanius inverted the argument so that the body said this of the soul, rather than *vice versa*, as here.

3. Rom 3.5-6.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-EIGHT

(1) We know that "all things are possible for God."¹ And he is also able to produce a body without a soul, and he is able <to make> bodies which have become obliterated come to life again and the very things to be set in motion on their own without souls, if he wishes, as even already through most holy Ezekiel he made such an economy. (2) For he was saying to the holy prophet, "Tell, son of man, bones to be united to bones and joint to joint."² And behold, would that you marvel at the power of God, because not as yet were souls being inserted. But with the bones being dry, not only did they have the power to move at the command of God, but also the bones were filled with understanding and knowledge that was not random. (3) For the bones for the feet were not proceeding near to the parts of the head according to forgetfulness, nor were the vertebrae of the neck, wandering about, seeking out the position round about the joints of the ankles. But each of the bones both was moved and was proceeding in accordance with understanding and was positioned by its own joint. (4) If at any rate God wishes, he is able also to raise a body without a soul. For in this he showed his power, in the first coming to life again, that thing which was despaired of by men, through commanding Ezekiel. (5) And he did not say, "Tell, son of man, the spirit to go first." But after making easy through faith that which is hard, I mean uniting the bodies, then he commanded the souls to enter into the same bodies. "And rose," it says, "a great assembly."³ (6) Therefore, it showed that God is able to make to come to life again even bodies apart from souls, just as has been shown by example, but the body is not able to be judged on its own accord. For it possesses a just defense toward the judgment of God. (7) For it even affirms it, saying, "Sin was from that soul; I myself was not guilty. For since I was released and that [soul] was away from me, I did not commit adultery, did I? I did not fornicate, did I? Nor did I steal, nor commit idolatry, nor do any of such

1. Mt 19.26.

2. Ezek 37.4, 7.

3. Ezek 37.10.

offenses, did I?"⁴ And the judgment of God will be ineffectual according to the argument of those who love contentiousness. (8) Because of this, as one man has come to be from God, composed of the body and the soul, again the just judge raises up the body and puts its soul in it. And thus the judgment of God will be just, with both [body and soul] having a share either of retribution on account of sin or of virtue on account of religion and the future reward to be given to the saints.

CHAPTER EIGHTY-NINE

(1) For believing that we have these things sufficiently for the demonstration of the truth of our hope, we provided a few things, instead of many. Because of those who say that another body is raised instead of that which falls, again with toil we continue, wishing to aid those who wish to understand and lest they be tempted to destroy their life. (2) For would that it be that we, the least and worthless, labor and help both ourselves and all, and that the resurrection of our flesh not be denied, in which the whole treasure and foundation of all sound reason and hope of all service are ordered according to what has been said: "having this treasure in earthen vessels,"¹ and what follows. (3) For being weak, we practice self-restraint; humble, we live in chastity; lacking power, we desire to practice charity on account of the reception of what is being expected, [that is,] of the resurrection of the dead. (4) And thus has been established the canon of faith and of hope of the love of God and of the testimony on behalf of the name of God in persecutions, tortures, and other punishments of men on those who do not deny the resurrection of our flesh. But they believe that which is "sown" in the earth will be raised. (5) For the divine Scriptures gave to us two clear and true testimonies, through which we are able to know the hope of our resurrection and not to be overthrown by the myths of vainglorious men who were deceived and wrote deceit in this life. So lest I provide too many testimonies (for there

4. Cf. *Pan.* 64.71.12.

1. 2 Cor 4.7.

are not a few in the New and Old [Testaments] concerning our hope and resurrection), I will say this briefly.

CHAPTER NINETY

(1) If that which is raised were something else, just as some people assert, the Apostle [Paul] would not maintain strongly, saying, "For it is necessary that this which is corrupt put on incorruption, and that which is mortal put on immortality."¹ (2) Since it is also necessary concerning the glory of the saints, as they are destined both to be cleansed and to be changed in glory after the resurrection (just as it says, "it is raised in glory"),² for us to be established in hope, the holy Scripture says, "You fool, what you sow is not made alive, if it did not die. And you do not sow the very body which will come to be, but it may be a seed of wheat or some other seed. And God gives to it a body as he wished."³ (3) It said this for the glory of those being raised in brilliance. And in order that it might show that the "seed" itself is receiving the glory, on his own account the one even "who spoke in Paul"⁴ said in the Gospel concerning the resurrection: "Unless the seed of wheat which fell to the earth dies," he says, "it remains alone. But if it dies, it bears many seeds."⁵ (4) Then at any rate the Apostle [Paul] said a "seed," and the Savior pointed out the same seed of the body on his own account. So what will we say? The very thing which was sown, his own body, that is to say the "seed," rose? Or was there another thing from him which rose out of the tomb after the three days? (5) As the angels say, "He rose; he is not here,"⁶ and as he says to Mary, "Do not hold onto me. For not yet have I ascended to my Father,"⁷ and as he shows his hands and side to Thomas, saying, "Do not be an unbeliever but a believer."⁸ (6) For unbelieving is the saying, "He did not rise wholly," and wickedly believing is the saying, "The very thing which even died did not rise." But believing is the saying that the body itself rose; and from the same body which he raised, he appointed ours for the hope of truth.

1. 1 Cor 15.53.

4. 2 Cor 13.3.

7. Jn 20.17.

2. 1 Cor 15.43.

5. Jn 12.24.

8. Jn 20.27.

3. 1 Cor 15.36-38.

6. Mk 16.6.

CHAPTER NINETY-ONE

(1) For to this end he even let alone the marks of the nails, not wiping them away, nor the mark of the spear, and indeed at any rate he entered through closed doors.¹ For his fleshly [body] rose a spiritual one, but not another besides the one which is, but the very one which is, united to the divinity, adorned in the immateriality of the spirit. (2) For if it was not of an immateriality of spirit, what sort of opening was receiving the bulky body? But in order that he might demonstrate that that very thing which is corruptible [bodies] of us is clothed in incorruption in truth (for if it is also mortal, it is clothed in immortality), he entered through closed doors, in order that he might demonstrate that that which is dense is rarefied, and that which is mortal is immortal, and that which is corruptible is incorruptible.² (3) In order that he might put to shame all those who do not believe in our salvation, I mean the resurrection, the one who, changes his body into immateriality and commingled the <flesh after the> resurrection into spirit, did not cast aside the scars of the nails nor the mark of the spear. (4) But he demonstrated that very thing [body] which has suffered on the cross, that it was not something else which rose nor was he producing another thing from himself, but that the very one which has suffered is impassible, and he himself is the fallen seed which rose, but rose incorruptible. (5) And again in order that we might not believe some part has been raised from him, on the one hand the whole [body] itself did not see destruction, (for it says, "You will not give your holy one to see destruction,"³ and on the other hand the whole [body] itself rose, <for> it says, "He rose; he is not here."⁴ (6) If he was raised and is "not here," he truly rose. And the Scriptures do not err, being our life. And in order that those who have been deceived might not find an excuse, he showed his bones and flesh to Thomas and was saying to his disciples, "See me, that I myself am. For a spirit does not have bones and flesh, just as you behold me having."⁵

1. Cf. Jn 20.25-27.

2. Cf. *Pan.* 77.29.1-7. The word translated "rarefied" is λεπτομερές.

3. Ps 15.10; Acts 2.27. 4. Mk 16.6.

5. Lk 24.39.

CHAPTER NINETY-TWO

(1) And if someone who is contriving deceit says, "But the body of our Savior was special on account of it only having been received from Mary and without a seed of man, then at least was it also another [body] of Adam besides our own, because only he received it from the earth without a seed of man?" But no one is able to say or to demonstrate this. (2) But if again someone contriving deceit says, "The whole [body] alone of Christ rose, but ours is not raised, but another instead of it." So why does it say, "Christ rose, the first-fruit of those who have fallen asleep"?¹ Even the body itself is one thing, a first-fruit of those which are raised. (3) How Christ has become the first-fruit of those who have fallen asleep, let them learn, and again let them not turn to another error, and let them not believe that other Scriptures deceive. (4) For before him he raised Lazarus² and the son of the widow, the one in Nain.³ And Elijah raised the dead,⁴ but also Elisha raised two dead people, one while still present and one buried.⁵ (5) But those who arose again have died, and they wait for the one and universal resurrection. Christ, "first-fruit of those who have fallen asleep,"⁶ because he rose, "no longer dies; death no longer rules him,"⁷ according to what has been written.⁸ (6) For he died once, enduring passion on our behalf because of our passions. He tasted of death once, "of death on a cross,"⁹ the *Logos*, who went to death willingly for us, in order that by means of death, he might put death to death: (7) the *Logos* who became flesh, not suffering in divinity, but suffering together with humanity, a suffering being reckoned to him, with him remaining in immortality, but rather his whole self being immortality. (8) For he said, "I am the life."¹⁰ And not through flesh is there hope for us. "Accursed," for it says, "is the one hoping in man. And he will be like a tamarisk-shrub."¹¹

1. 1 Cor 15.20.

4. 1 Kgs 17.17-24.

7. Rom 6.9.

10. Jn 11.25.

2. Cf. Jn 11.1-6.

5. 2 Kgs 4.32-37; 13.21.

8. Cf. *Pan.* 64.65.1-4.

11. Jer 17.5-6.

3. Cf. Lk 7.11-17.

6. 1 Cor 15.20.

9. Phil 2.8.

CHAPTER NINETY-THREE

(1) So what will we say? Christ was not a man? From what has been foretold, it is clear to all that unambiguously we confess that the Lord, God-*Logos* has become man not in appearance, but in truth. But he was not a man who came in a progression of divinity. (2) For the hope of our salvation is not in dependence upon a man. For no one of all the men from Adam, was able to accomplish salvation, but [only] God-*Logos*, having become a man, in order that our hope may not be dependent upon a man, but upon the living and true God, who became man. (3) "For every priest who is taken from among men is appointed on behalf of men,"¹ according to what has been written. Whence from our flesh, the Lord who came took up the flesh, and the God-*Logos* became a man like us, in order that that in divinity he might give to us salvation and in his humanity might suffer on behalf of us men, undoing passion through passion and putting death to death through his own death. (4) The passion was reckoned to the divinity, even though the divinity is impassible, because thus the holy and impassible God-*Logos*, who came, was well-pleased. (5) A thing such as this is an analogy: it is as if a person has clothed himself with a cloak, and on the cloak, blood besprinkled might stain the cloak. And it did not reach the body of the one who has clothed himself, but the stain of the blood is reckoned to the one who has clothed himself with the cloak. (6) Thus Christ has suffered in the flesh, I say, in the Lord's-man himself, which the holy God-*Logos* himself, who came from the heavens, formed. As the holy Peter says, "put to death in flesh, but made alive in spirit,"² and again, "So with Christ suffering in flesh on our behalf, may you also prepare the same intention."³ (7) Even as the blood on the cloak is reckoned to the one wearing it, the passion of the flesh was reckoned to him in his divinity, although it suffered nothing, in order that the world may not have hope in man, but in the Lord's-man, (8) with the divinity taking up the passion to be reckoned to it,

1. Heb 5.1.

2. 1 Pt 3.18.

3. 1 Pt 4.1. Cf. *Anc.* 36.6; *Pan.* 77.33.1-2.

in order that the salvation on behalf of the world might be from an impassible divinity, in order that the passion which came to be in the flesh might be reckoned to the divinity, even though it suffered nothing, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled which says, "for if they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory,"⁴ and what follows.

CHAPTER NINETY-FOUR

(1) So he was crucified; the Lord was crucified, and we fall down and worship him who has been crucified, the one who was buried and rose on the third day and ascended into heaven. "O depth of the riches both of wisdom and knowledge of God,"¹ according to what has been written. (2) "For in part we know, and in part we prophesy,"² as a drop from a sea, drawing for ourselves from the knowledge of God and comprehending an analogy of such an economy, the grace of our hope with the good pleasure of the Father, by the will of the Son, together with the will of the Holy Spirit, <the mystery?> of the same economy of God. (3) All the Scriptures here and there were holding fast the proclamation of the resurrection, but the completion was being preserved for the *parousia* of the enhypostatic *Logos* himself. (4) "For Christ is the fulfillment of the law,"³ according to what has been written. For where was the divine Scripture not speaking concerning the resurrection?⁴ First the blood of Abel proclaims it, for after his dying, "he still speaks,"⁵ the Scripture says. "Enoch was transformed and was not found and did not see death. For he was well-pleasing to God."⁶ Noah constructed an ark from the command of God, accomplishing a rebirth for himself with his household home.⁷ (5) Abraham in old age receives a child, "although the body already was dead",⁸

4. 1 Cor 2.8.

1. Rom 11.33.

2. 1 Cor 13.9.

3. Rom 10.4.

4. Compare what follows here with *Pan.* 9.3.1-5.

5. Heb 11.4; cf. Gn 4.10.

6. Heb 11.5; cf. Gn 5.24.

7. Cf. Heb 11.7.

8. Cf. Rom 4.19; Heb 11.11.

and from the dead, God has given hope, especially with "the mother Sarah" being "dead." And that which "has been made old and has approached destruction,"⁹ the fount which became barren from the ordering [of life] according to the custom of a woman, receives back the power for the sowing of a seed, and the aged woman conceives <as if> a younger woman. And from "death," Isaac was handed over living to his father.¹⁰ (6) For God, handing over to the father a living son from the dead, was proclaiming the hope of the resurrection. (7) Jacob points out the subject, not assigning the hope of his bones in second place, for he was taking care of such, not as being destroyed, but as going to come to life again. And not incidentally, he was commanding that they be brought back out of the land of the Egyptians.¹¹ (8) And Joseph indicated this: "You will carry up my bones together," saying: "for with a visit the Lord will watch over you."¹² If there was no hope of resurrection, why was there the care for his bones <in the> command to the just men concerning the bones that were undergoing decay? (9) The first expression to Moses is the testimony of God: "I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob,"¹³ of those who are "asleep" in the world, but living beside me. One and the same Spirit is the one who spoke in the Law and who teaches in the Gospel. For to the Sadducees the Savior indicated this: "The one who speaks in the prophets; <behold>, I am he."¹⁴

CHAPTER NINETY-FIVE

(1) And let the staff of Aaron show, being dry perhaps for many years and left behind in the tent from evening until dawn. For with men, after labors, living branches, through twelve months according to a period of a completed year, produce fruit, when the sun warms and rain waters and dew spreads out, causing [them] to grow, night and day, (2) <but> in one night God made a difficult thing easy. For the dry staff sprouted and

9. Heb 8.13.

10. Cf. Heb 11.17-19. 11. Cf. Gn 49.29-30.

12. Gn 50.25; Ex 13.19. 13. Ex 3.6.

14. This particular expression is not found in the canonical Gospels.

shot forth leaves and ripe fruit.¹ For God showed the similar things with the future resurrection, which will be brought about by him. (3) When children are conceived in accordance with sacred marriage, which the Lord revealed, first a seed of the natural ordering is sown, as the Lord made known, in the procreative womb. When the cycle of time is accomplished, that which was sown in the belly is brought to completion through nine months' time, and I mean under the calculation of nine months that which is conceived and begotten is accomplished fully. (4) But in the resurrection it will not be thus, for the work will be in an instant. "For a trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised incorruptible."² As the Lord showed in the tent of the testimony, the nuts, which become "pregnant" on the living branches through twelve months, cover over on the dry staff, and sprouts come to be in the course of one night. (5) And not only [this], but also within a single instant of time did he accomplish fully what comes to be through twelve months, as has been said. And in like manner the babe who comes to be through nine months in the womb, who through much time has been put together, is completed, <but> in the resurrection what has been completed is made to rise in an instant.

CHAPTER NINETY-SIX

(1) Let the power of the Lord persuade the unbelievers; no one "resist his purpose."¹ Let him listen to Moses, and let him show. "What is in your hand?" says the Lord. And he said, "A staff."² The staff itself was wooden, and entirely dried. And he says, "Throw it on the ground. And he threw the dry staff."³ (2) And God was making wet that which was dry, and not only wet, but even alive, but also having been changed in nature and having been fashioned differently in *ousia*.⁴ (3) The work was

1. Cf. Nm 17.1-8.

2. 1 Cor 15.52.

1. Rom 9.19.

2. Ex 4.2.

3. Ex 4.3.

4. On the significance of Epiphanius's use of the terms "nature" and *ousia* here, see Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 311-12. The "nature" seemed to refer to its outer appearance, which has been altered, but the *ousia* referred to its essence as a staff, which remained the same but was refashioned.

not an illusion. For a truth of God is accomplished by a command, and it is not a fantasy. For in all things he set our thinking straight through the truth of Moses. (4) For the prophet knew that that which happened when he fled was not in appearance, but in truth. For if he knew that which happened was a fantasy, he would not have run away from the face of the serpent. (5) But not again will this become a snare for those who love contention and said, "Because the staff was another, 'God gave' to it a different sort of 'body, as he willed.'"⁵ And so first let them learn that he did not animate one in place of another, (6) but that he animated that very one which was dry. [Let them learn] that this is the body that was given to the staff and being set in motion by him, as a type or form, that God was not calling it for judgment nor did he wish to judge the serpent in place of the staff, (7) but he accomplished the certainty of the resurrection through the staff. God was making known his own power, in order that one might not disbelieve his power in all things. And he did the very thing with all assurance, for he did not raise some part of the staff, but he changed the whole staff, as he willed.

CHAPTER NINETY-SEVEN

(1) And because these things are thus, and the dead have hope of everlasting life and "those in the tombs will rise,"¹ summon again for me the trustworthy Moses as witness. For with Reuben having committed trespasses, his father, the holy Jacob the patriarch, curses him and says, "Reuben, my firstborn and first of my children, broken out in insolence as water, may you not boil over. For you went up into the bed of your father, and you uncovered it," he says, "where you went up."² (2) And in the Hebrew, *elthothar*, the very thing which is being translated as "may you not return," or "would that you not add," or again "may you not abound," is simplified in the phrase, "may you not boil over." And interpreters translated it thus. (3) And <if> you

5. 1 Cor 15.38.

1. Is 26.19.

2. Gn 49.3-4.

wish to learn that these things are thus, and that death was limited by his father to this man who has sinned, Moses will clearly explain to you. (4) For even he [Moses] blessing the twelve tribes, having come to Reuben and having known that Levi [would be] priest (for in the hand of the priesthood, sins were atoned for and bound), he says, "Let Reuben live, and may he not die."³ (5) But how was the one who had been buried one hundred and twenty-six years before able to live? (6) But since he also knew completely that the future resurrection is going to be, he knows [that there will be] a second death, that which is through condemnation on the day of judgment. Wishing to relieve him at the price of the one punishment from what is in the future, he [Moses] says, "Let him live" (7) (indicating the resurrection, for he knew that all will live), "and may he not die," that is, may he not be charged with the second death, the one which is through condemnation and with eternal torment. (8) For if he [Moses] cared about the penalty of life for him, it was sufficient only to say, "Let Reuben live." But since he gives an indication concerning what is in the future, he says, "Let Reuben live, and may he not die."⁴

CHAPTER NINETY-EIGHT

(1) And whence might someone be able to collect so many testimonies concerning our hope and expectation of the resurrection, of the one in truth and not in appearance? (2) For let the vainglorious and lovers of contention speak their folly, whether at some time a part of bodies rises and part of all in turn, or again of whom the whole is raised, and of whom in turn is the partial resurrection, and of whom the whole body. What is such a partiality as this? Then is there "partiality with God"?¹ "By no means!"² (3) Let us investigate how or when saints raised a dead person in parts and not the whole body. The son of the widow in Zarephath rose whole, and a part was not left behind.³ The son of the Shu-

3. Dt 33.6.

4. Ibid. Cf. *Pan.* 9.3.5.

1. Rom 2.11.

2. Rom 6.2.

3. 1 Kgs 17.17-24.

nammite woman rose whole and allowed none of his limbs not to rise.⁴ (4) And <the> Lord raised Lazarus, and he did not leave behind a remnant in the tomb. But with the grave-clothes and other coverings <he rose?>,⁵ and [there is] not at all a use for clothes in the day of judgment. (5) He raised the whole son of the woman in Nain,⁶ the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue,⁷ the daughter of the centurion.⁸ And O, the vain opinion of those who reckon such things, that he raises a part and leaves behind a part! (6) Let us see from the very ones who have been presented and who already equally have become of hope to us. All of Enoch was transferred,⁹ and he has never seen death. And all of Elijah was taken up in body,¹⁰ and he has never seen death, in order that in two living bodies he [God] might present to us the perfect resurrection. (7) And in order that no one may doubt, he <presented?> two figures of two firstborn men of our resurrection. Enoch was among the uncircumcised, and the uncircumcision did not prevent the resurrection nor the reception of the body throughout a course of living life. Elijah was in circumcision, in order that <the> resurrection might not be believed to be for some and not others, but wholly universal. (8) Elijah was [living] in virginity, in order that he might declare to the world the preeminence of virginity, as well as immortality, and the incorruption [associated] with the body. But in order that the resurrection and the permanence of the body might not be believed to be only in the case of virginity, Enoch was not a virgin, but was temperate and begot children. And these two men are living, persevering in body and soul for the sake of hope.

CHAPTER NINETY-NINE

(1) And so that no one may doubt again, he also led down others into Hades with their bodies. For the earth opened its mouth and swallowed Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Korah and On, and they, living in body and soul, descended into Hades. For from the very time they were handed over to judgment,

4. 2 Kgs 4.8-37.

5. Cf. Jn 11.44.

6. Lk 7.11-17.

7. Mk 5.22-24, 35-43.

8. Mt 8.5-13.

9. Heb 11.5; cf. Gn 5.24.

10. 2 Kgs 2.1.

neither [were they] loosed from their bodies, nor was a remnant handed over, nor parts, but with all handed over, with body and soul, into punishment.¹ (2) Job says, "until I come to be again,"² and, "this body, the one suffering these things,"³ and, "You renew me," and again, "Your youth will be renewed as of the eagle."⁴ Isaiah [says], "The dead will rise and those in tombs will be raised."⁵ For he came, the one "who loosens in courage those who have been bound, similarly those who provoke, those who dwell in graves."⁶ (3) Job says, "A man dead no longer arose, nor will he know his place."⁷ For truly even day-by-day the resurrection does not come to be, but has been determined in one day. Proving that he knew in what sort of appointed time he was awaiting, straightaway he solved the question: "until heaven is not stitched together."⁸ (4) For so far as heaven and earth are, still also bodies exist on the earth. But whenever "the one rolling heaven as a scroll" and shaking the earth may come, then "even those who are in the dust of the earth will be raised."⁹ (5) Because of this, he [God] says to Ezekiel, "Son of man, tell bones to be united to bones and joint to joint," and thus it came to be; and "to come to be on them sinews and veins, and flesh and hair and nails."¹⁰ And again, "Say, son of man, 'Come, wind, from the four corners of the earth,'"¹¹ from the places that are manifestly locked storehouses of souls. (6) And for what reason does the Lord himself not speak, but commands a man to speak? Because what the Lord says at once he also does, and it is no longer undone. He ordered the man to speak, in order that after the rising again, the hope of our salvation might be indicated at the time, and a word of man might be undone, and not [a word] of the Lord. He was intending those bones to die again. But whenever the Lord may say, "Rise again," they are raised and do not die. For a word of God will not be undone.

1. Nm 16.1-40.

4. Ps 102.5.

7. Jb 14.12; cf. Ps 102.16.

10. Cf. Ezek 37.4-8.

2. Jb 14.14.

5. Is 26.19.

8. Jb 14.12.

11. Ezek 37.9.

3. Jb 19.26.

6. Ps 67.7.

9. Cf. Is 34.4; Dn 12.2.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED

(1) Because of this also, the Lord, who came in the flesh, raised the dead, in order that that which exists through the flesh might die again, until the flesh itself might rise and might no longer die, and [in order that] he [the Lord] might no longer stay silent, saying to only one: "Rise,"¹ "Come out,"² until he might come and might speak no longer singly, "Rise," but "Let all rise," accomplishing the universal resurrection. For he is the resurrection of the dead.³ (2) For thus after the rising from the dead, he raised no one <except> of those who recently died. For with him rose "all bodies of the saints who have died, and they were seen by many,"⁴ "[they who were] entering into the bridal-chamber with him,"⁵ according to what has been written in the Gospel. (3) And it did not say, "a part of the bodies of the saints rose," but "bodies of the saints." And "they were made visible to many," not being other people besides those who have died, but being recognized by their own, because they had died not long before. (4) And our Lord, wishing to show the miracle to others, indeed showing, he was making those difficult things easy. And when he goes to the girl who recently died, the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, although she has died that very hour, he deemed it worthy to say to her, "Rise, child,"⁶ indeed with "Rise," reinforcing what has already been undone, since she was still on the bed. (5) The son of the widow in Nain, since he was already being carried out in the coffin, he raised him more easily: "for he grasped the coffin"⁷ and did not say anything to the child, but only grasped the coffin, and he arose. (6) What is still deepest and greater by far compared with a hope of men, is when he came to Lazarus on the fourth day, neither did he say "Rise," nor did he grasp the tomb with his hand. But thus at once he calls on his own authority, "Lazarus, come out."⁸ (7) By far the [saying] "come out" is easier and more feasible in comparison with the grasping, but the grasping again is easier by far than the ordering, "Child, rise." Thus

1. Cf. Lk 8.54.

4. Mt 27.52-53.

7. Lk 7.14.

2. Cf. Jn 11.43.

5. Cf. Mt 25.10.

8. Jn 11.43.

3. Cf. Jn 11.25.

6. Lk 8.54.

the holy *Logos* of God does all things, in order that he might show the hope of the resurrection to us.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED ONE

(1) If I wished to select all the testimonies from all the Scriptures, on the one hand our mind is small, both humble and uneducated; nevertheless, on account of the many I extend my argument to a greater length. I will speak briefly, because our salvation is concise, and overall, it is of the one hope of the resurrection which has been proclaimed to us. (2) These things unbelievers do not believe, false believers corrupt, lovers of contention do not accept, the vainglorious reject. May God offer his mercy to all and shine through those of their thoughts that have been darkened. (3) For the *Hellenes*, who did <not> receive the Holy Spirit, will be put to shame by the truth and all the aforementioned testimonies, but especially by you, the sons of the holy church of God and of the orthodox faith. (4) For may you teach, you who received the Holy Spirit and were deemed worthy of the well-placed word "in the opening of the mouth,"¹ first, that you were deemed worthy to be disciples of Christ, of the "chief shepherd"² and "of the guardian of our souls."³ Because you, who gathered together nourishment for the flocks of Christ, your own people, <and> in such a manner are caring both for yourselves and the sheep of God, and I say, the one wishing to be helped in all ways, may you rear them from the holy land that was hinted at by Moses. (5) Who, of those thinking well of you, the devout and trusted of guardians, O orthodox men and sons of the church (for by saying "some," I speak of all the sons of the truth, according to what has been written), who will doubt concerning these things? (6) For being sons of a wise and most courageous "woman," whose fame was in the hands of Solomon, who says, "Who will find a courageous woman?"⁴ (as being rare, nay rather a single one), may you choose that which is stronger and love that which is helpful. (7) Think with me that the courageous woman is the church of God, your

1. Eph 6.19.

2. 1 Pt 5.4.

3. 1 Pt 2.25.

4. Prov 31.10.

mother, than which nothing is more courageous, dying in accordance with each persecution, being roused on behalf of the name of her husband.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED TWO

(1) So this most gentle woman asks her groom in the Song of Songs exactly, "Where do you tend your flock? Where do you make it sleep at noon?"¹ Christ tends his flock in the aforementioned holy land; and not only does he tend his flock, but he also orders to loosen the sandals of the feet of the shepherds, as he says first to Moses. (2) Having received the tradition from him, you yourselves also lead by the hand first those being led steadfastly into the holy knowledge, taking care that the sandals of each be untied. (3) And the sandals of each of us are different. For by each person's own action, each person was shod. And the rest of you disciples and each one listening to good shepherds, [each one] who on the one hand was shod with idolatry, was unshod by your admonition, on the other hand another was unshod from adultery, another from fornication, another from theft, and [another] who [was unshod] from greed. (4) Not only [these], but also renouncing hateful arguments and shameful statements, with glorious hopes "under the mighty hand"² of the good Shepherd through you good men, each of the disciples hands himself over to be tended. For each will be kept in all ways from error. (5) And set the truth before your eyes, marking idols as false and openly proclaiming the error concerning them (for you do not believe in these dead ones, since they never lived), and always teaching reasonably all people that they [idols] are empty and vain and never existing.³ (6) For they were not ever existing, in order that those men may be <something>. But they are demonic, a juxtaposition of human thinking, encouraging the pretexts for pleasures. And

1. Song 1.7.

2. Cf. 1 Pt 5.6.

3. On *Anc.* 102.5–106.9, see J. Dummer, "Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides," *Philologus* 138.2 (1994): 267–87. He argues that the information in these sections was derived from another source, which was also used by Aristides in his *apologia*.

thence by each person, one's own passion has been undertaken as an established object of worship. (7) For first straightaway when this was innovated by men through the ill works of demons, this "foremost idolatry,"⁴ was spoken as an opinion, and idols were formed in rough drawings.⁵ Thereafter his own skill, which each person was possessing in his hands, through which he had means, he was handing down for an object of worship to his own children. And through his own handiwork he was molding for himself gods out of wood, even just as a potter from clay, a woodworker from wood, a gold-worker from gold, and a silver-smith [from silver].

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED THREE

(1) Still again each person was conceiving his own passion into likenesses <before> his own eyes, some blood-thirsty man thinking up Ares; an adulterer or adulteress, the promiscuous Aphrodite; a tyrant, who gave new wings to Nike. (2) For an austere person and one who has gaped at worldly things was drawing the figure of Kronos, and the one who is becoming feminine Kybele and Rhea because of the state of flux, I think, of the confusion from the bodies. (3) Besides a wandering man or woman was forming the huntress Artemis and drunkard Dionysos and heavy-laborer Herakles, and someone promiscuous Zeus and Apollo. (4) And what is it to me to tell of the multitudes of countless passions which exist in men? Most of all, the Egyptians, who strayed, not only worshiped their own passions, but winged and four-footed things, both things on land and in the water, some untamed wild things and those which were given in order to them by the holy God as slaves, "they exchanged."¹ (5) And as they are irrational in their thinking, they

4. Wis 14.12.

5. See J. Dummer, "Epiphanius, Ancor. 102,7 und die Sapientia Salomonis," *Klio* 43-45 (1965): 344-50, for another argument on Epiphanius's use of a source or source collection for these sections on pagan mythology and practices. Cf. *Pan.* 3.3.4 on the development of the first idols in paintings.

1. Cf. Wis 12.24; Rom 1.25. On the idolatry of the Egyptians, see also Aristides, *apologia* 12; Theophilus of Antioch, *ad Autolyicum* 1.10; Clem., *protrepticus* 39.5-6; Pseudo-Clement, *homiliae Clementinae* 6.23; Ps.-Clem., *recognitiones* 5.20. See Dum-

worship above all the animals, the ones deified by them, and they do not feel shame: a barking dog, a reptile-eating cat, a licentious he-goat, a gentle sheep, a many-toed and most gloomy crocodile, a poison-eating ibis, kites, falcons, most servile crows, a twisted and most odious snake. (6) And in general, O, the great shame of those who do not understand their refutation with their sense of sight, of those who neither receive perception with their ears nor understand with their thinking among those who become foolish.² (7) Having been struck at any rate with a bad fate, they are neither being illuminated by their own philosophers nor becoming fellow-spectators with those who contemplate the truth.³ (8) For they do not listen to Diagoras, the one who lit a fire underneath his own wooden Herakles because of a lack of wood and mockingly says to it, "carry on indeed, Herakles, may you come, finishing your thirteenth labor, boiling our dish for us."⁴ Indeed, having taken and splintered it, laughing at his own god as if not existing, jesting, he was feeding himself with it serving up breakfast.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED FOUR

(1) Another person, Herakleitos, says to the Egyptians: "If gods exist, on account of what do you bewail them?" (For shrilly bewailing Typhon and Osiris and other subterranean gods that have been buried, they lament). This man at any rate says, "If gods exist, on account of what do you bewail them? But if they

mer, "Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides," 273-79, for the relationship between the accounts on the development of the Egyptian religion by Epiphanius and Aristides and again how both writers were using another anti-pagan source.

2. Cf. Is 6.9. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Ein Stück aus dem *Ancoratus* des Epiphanius," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1911): 759-72, offered his own text for *Anc.* 103.6-106.9, and Holl noted the variant readings in his *apparatus criticus*. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff also argued that Epiphanius drew on the work of Clement of Alexandria, though Dummer, "Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides," has shown otherwise.

3. On the "fellow-spectators," cf. Clem., *prot.* 12.1.

4. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 24.4.

have died, you bewail them in vain.”¹ (2) Another person, a comic named Eudaimon, says, “If indeed gods exist, I am not able to speak concerning them nor explain what sort of kind they are. For there are many things which hinder me.”² (3) And Homer says, “The rule of many is not good.”³ And Philemon, another comic, says, “Those who worship one god have good hopes for salvation.”⁴ (4) For Apis the chaff-eating bull straightaway was struck in the thigh with a sword by Kambyeses, the king of the Assyrians, in order that, if blood flowed, it might be proved as not a god.⁵ (5) And the followers of Kronos do not deny that their own god was enclosed with iron chains; thus they believe. And if someone is in prison, not simply is it that he is subject to one large [prison], but also as a criminal such a one is in prison.⁶ (6) And if also there will be an argument from me concerning Isis, the one being called by name now both Atthis and Io, daughter of Apis the Cappadocian, also called Inachus, I am ashamed equally to proclaim the deeds of those people.⁷ (7) I will not, however,

1. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 24.2–3, though Dummer, “Epiphanius von Constantia und die Apologie des Aristides,” 280, argues that neither the Diagoras nor the Heraclitus anecdote was based on Clement’s work.

2. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 3.7, has this quotation in the mouth of Protagoras of Abdera. Cf. Epiph., *expositio fidei* 9.20, 9.24.

3. Homer, *Iliad* 2.204.

4. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 3.7. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, “Ein Stück,” 763–64, reads instead “Euphemon” for the otherwise obscure author.

5. Cf. Herodotus, 3.27–29; Clem., *prot.* 52.6. Holl rendered the name in the text *Κάμπερος*, which is a clear reference to Cambyeses, though here he is king of the Assyrians.

6. Epiph., *exp. fid.* 11.2, described some of the practices of the followers of Kronos.

7. Epiphanius later reiterated the origin of Isis in *Pan.* 4.2.5. On Io as the daughter of Inachus and her connection to Isis in earlier writings, see Eus., *p.e.* 10.9.20; Jer., *Chronicon* 27b.14–17, 44b.1–3.

From 104.7–108.1, J. Leipoldt, “Epiphanius’ von Salamis ‘Ancoratus’ in saïdischer Übersetzung,” *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 54 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902): 136–71, provides a Coptic text of an ancient translation (dated by Leipoldt sometime in the fifth century), which antedates the earliest Greek manuscript. Leipoldt offered a parallel Greek text, based on the Jena codex, as well as a German translation. All of this work preceded the GCS edition. Holl was aware of Leipoldt’s study, and he considered and incorporated certain

be ashamed to talk about what things they are not ashamed to worship. Let the worshipers of this one [Isis] and of foam-born Aphrodite be ashamed, they who exhort their own daughters and wives and sisters to imitate the deeds of the gods themselves.⁸ (8) And simply loving Osiris, their own brother, <and> Typhon, the other brother, they enlist their own siblings against one another. Much is the shame of the goddess, the one who does not have a sense of respect for her own brother, but who loves and is not satisfied with men from the outside [of her family], but even drew near to her own brother. (9) And not only this, but also she intimates fratricide because of her own insatiable desire of lust for her nearest. (10) And she conceives one child, Horos, <for whom?> she was not able to prove who truly is his legitimate father. For if she names Typhon, it is doubtful that he was his beggetter. But if [she names] Osiris, who would prove the accuracy of this? (11) Such a mother was teaching <him that he became> a "good" god, taking him and prostituting herself ten years in Tyre.⁹ (12) But making Apis, king of the inhabitants of Sinope, into the god Serapis, they were slaves to a tyrant rather than to truth.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED FIVE

(1) These are the "rewards" of the gods being honored among the Egyptians, about each of whom in turn much time will be spent in speaking. But the *Hellenes*, who suppose that there is some great thing among them, who philosophize only with arguments and sharpness of tongue and not with deeds, were ruined most of all. (2) Whosoever derives Kronos from Ouranos, saying that he has been produced from Ouranos and

emendations (others not) to the text, all of which are noted in the *apparatus criticus* of the GCS volume.

8. In his critical edition, Holl noted that the reference to Aphrodite does not seem to be correct; and based on a reading of Plutarch's *de Iside et Osiride*, he suggested that the name of the goddess Nephthys should be amended to the text. I agree with Holl's conclusion, although he ultimately did not make the emendation, and I have rendered the translation following the text as it stands. See also Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Ein Stück," 765.

9. Cf. Arist., *apol.* 12, though he has Isis in Byblos.

has cut the members of his own father (O wicked deed and shameful opinion!); if the latter had not been cut, there would have been many Kronos-es.¹ (3) This “noble” one, he who until having overtaken his father was not satisfied with the first impiety, but on the one hand while young wronged his father (4) and on the other hand having become old, swallowed his own children, Poseidon and Pluto. But searching out Zeus and being duped by Rhea, he swallowed a large stone that was swaddled in place of the baby, perhaps just as if a god. (5) Being of “well-born” parents, as much as thus I can say, the son of this [god], Zeus being his name, was venturing to become the husband of all women, and the son of this [god] was Hermes. And would that according to the laws he became someone married, and not always seeking out illicit love and not an evil-doer! (6) For he seduces Penelope, having become a he-goat for the sake of pleasure. And I suppose he was becoming a he-goat on account of the vigor of the intermingling of the part covered by the “beard.” (7) With respect to Danae, he [Zeus] was becoming gold, in order that he might seduce the prudent virgin, who was confined in her home. But that one was not ever able to become gold, but being an imposter, he tricked the virgin by bribing her with gold. (8) And with Leda, in turn he becomes a swan, indicating again the clamor of the burning of his pleasure. (9) As an eagle, yet never having taken wing, he sits himself before others as a teacher of corrupters of boys. Never having become an eagle, but in a notorious ship, which is named “eagle” because of its speed, having sailed past Troy and having snatched away Ganymede, the son of the king, he caused ruin. (10) And with respect to Pasiphaë, he became a bull, in like manner also with respect to Europa.²

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED SIX

(1) And what is it to me to speak about the multitudes of this “noble” corrupter and teacher of corrupters? Of whose tomb

1. Cf. Ps.-Clem., *hom. Clem.* 4.16, 6.2.

2. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 32.5, 37.1–4; Ps.-Clem., *hom. Clem.* 5.11–15; Ps.-Clem., *recogn.* 10.21–23, for the improprieties of Zeus.

there are clearly not [just] a few.¹ For in the island of Crete on the mountain called Lasios up to now [one] is pointed to with a finger.² (2) For there are not one or two Zeus-es, but even three and four have become the number.³ For one of them is the aforementioned son of Kronos, the one who cast down into Tartarus his own father in the Kaukasian mountain,⁴ but another is called Latiaros, from whom gladiators have come to be. And another is [surnamed] Goat-singer, he who even set fire to his own hand.⁵ (3) Perhaps, being a god, he forgot that fire stings, and he was not in possession of the foreknowledge of the one speaking to the he-goat-satyr, the one who first found fire and approached to kiss it, [who said]: "Do not touch, he-goat. For when you touch, you will burn your beard."⁶ (4) And not one Athena has come to be, but many. One roaming and wandering around the lake Tritonis, but another is a daughter of Oceanos, another a daughter of Kronos, and many others.⁷ (5) There are many Artemis-es. One is the Ephesian, another is the daughter of Zeus and others in like manner not a few.⁸ And Dionysos-es: the Theban, but another is the son of Semele; one is [leader] over the Korybantes, and one being torn apart by the Titans, and one initiating into mysteries the meat distribution of the Kouretes.⁹ (6) Heracles is called among them a warder against evil, all of whose deeds I will leave unspoken, but I will explain one from them all, that one which is commended among them forthwith. It would be enough for this man to take up this labor, in order that he might become "salvation" in this life. For if he did not corrupt fifty virgins in one night, how was the world being "saved"? Rather, he was destroying it.¹⁰ (7) And

1. Cf. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 2.3.

2. Cf. Ps.-Clem., *hom. Clem.* 6.21; Ps.-Clem., *recogn.* 10.23.

3. Cf. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 1.10. Also cf. Cicero, *De deorum natura* 3.53; Arnobius, *Disputationes aduersus nationes* 4.14.

4. Cf. Ps.-Clem., *hom. Clem.* 6.21.

5. Cf. Ps.-Clem., *hom. Clem.* 4.16, 5.23, 6.21; Eus., *p.e.* 2.2.48, on the tomb of Kronos. On the surnames or epithets of Zeus, cf. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 3.8.

6. Cf. Plutarch, *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* 2.86F.

7. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 28.2.

8. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 38.3; Cic., *N. D.* 3.58.

9. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 12.2, 17.2-18.2, 19.1. Also cf. Cic., *N. D.* 3.58; Arn., *Disputationes aduersus nationes* 4.15.

10. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 33.4; Eus., *p.e.*, 2.2.31.

simply I confess to you, I find it difficult to describe in detail their wicked deeds. (8) Still the cruelest kings and tyrants, who have had certain longed-for persons and have buried them in the ground, though not having anything more to give to these [dead], (indeed such things and they themselves are perishable in accordance with who and what they are), for their affection of those [dead] they have handed down to their own subjects (as an error for the world) that their tombs are to be worshiped as [if they were tombs of gods], in dependence upon a wicked pretext.¹¹ As with Antinoös, the one who has been buried in [the city of] Antinoös and being laid in a pleasure-boat by Hadrian; he [Hadrian] arranged this.¹² (9) And Timogenes in Asia,¹³ both Kanobos, the helmsman of Menelaos, and the wife of this man, Enmenouthis, buried with funeral rites in Alexandria, are honored on the bank of the sea, standing apart twelve mile-markers. And Marnas, the slave of Asterion of Crete, [was buried] among the Gazaoi, and Kasios the shipmaster among the Pelusians.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED SEVEN

(1) So investigate all these things whenever in the midst of the church. Thus unbind those who were brought to a wicked model of a deadly path, and lead others from adultery into temperance and do not deliver them only from seeking out illicit love, but also from despising their own [wives] in accordance with continence, as yet "the season is short,"¹ as the holy Apostle [Paul] says. And instruct fornicators, in order that they might not be punished having done the unlawful action in the midst of both God and men. (2) And whenever you impart all these things, laboring through oral expression and through deeds, persuade them to accept all things from you, having done all things first in deed and having been modeled on you, confirming your words through your deeds, with which you taught yourselves first, in

11. Cf. Wis 14.15.

12. Cf. Clem., *prot.* 49.1; Ath., *contra gentes* 9.4.

13. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Ein Stück," 771, suggested this Timogenes was actually Theagenes of Thasos.

1. 1 Cor 7.29.

order that you might also instruct others. (3) For even keeping silence, maintain the manner of the sun, which "teaches" all people everywhere even in silence. For simply rising and keeping silence, it teaches better all of their skills. (4) And whenever you impart the benefit of all these things to your children or so to most faithful brothers, lead them forward on the one hand to walk upon the earth, on the other hand to have "citizenship in heaven."² Engender the zeal of monks in the greatest number. (5) By the firmest faith without dissimulation in you, who abhor heretics, who muzzle Manichaeans, Marcionites, and the rest similar to them, expel them from the fold of God, dismissing and bridling all of their pretexts. (6) For how many things are being spoken aloud boldly against God and against his holy prophets! Being vain and devoid of the Holy Spirit, they blaspheme against the Creator of all! And how many good things God gave through his holy prophets to all men according to the gift of prophecy, these [heretical] men hate the deepest things of the law and such things of the prophets, indeed being earthly and concerned with corporeal things, questioning, they do not perceive.³ (7) They blaspheme falsely. Straightaway do not hesitate to shake off their error from those who are listening, <refuting> them from true proofs. For through such statements, fools are brought down, just as twigs in a current of a swollen river.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED EIGHT

(1) They said that "good" is the God of the law,¹ who, being ignorant where Adam is, was asking, saying, "Adam, where are you?"² And he says to Cain, "Where is Abel, your brother?"³ and to Abraham, "Where is Sarah, your wife?"⁴ and many other things such as these.⁵ (2) The very ones who say such things believe in God the Savior [only] in mouth and not in truth,

2. Cf. Phil 3.20.

3. Cf. 1 Cor 2.14.

1. Epiphanius placed the same expression in the mouth of Mani in *Pan.* 66.83.2, and, as there, here it must have an ironic sense.

2. Gn 3.9.

3. Gn 4.9.

4. Gn 18.9.

5. Cf. *Anc.* 38.7-8.

[that is] in the one who is God and has foreknowledge, who inquires the very things [in the New] similarly to the Old Testament: "Where have you placed Lazarus?"⁶ and, "Who touched me?"⁷ and, "Do you have bread with you?"⁸ and, "What do you wish?"⁹ or, "Whom do you seek?"¹⁰ (3) Well, then, the refutation against these people is obvious and easy. For as the Son, who has foreknowledge, inquires, thus also the Father himself inquires in the Law, the one who is the same always and unchanging. (4) For if he says, "Where have you placed Lazarus?"¹¹ he is ignorant neither of the Gospel nor the Old Testament. For he says, "Where have you placed him?" wishing to convict the women who have not exhibited the same faith in proportion to the Shunammite woman, and indeed at any rate of that woman who had [faith] in a man, that is, in Elisha the holy prophet,¹² and of those around Martha who have [faith] in God.¹³ (5) And if he says, "Who touched me?"¹⁴ he says it not from ignorance, but in order that he might persuade the woman to confess of her own accord, in order that the Son of God might not bear witness concerning himself, but might be glorified by others.¹⁵ (6) And when he said, "Do you have bread with you?"¹⁶ on this he speaks, in order that the small quantity of bread might be indicated to all and that the greatness of his miracle might be marveled at, through so much bread for so large a throng that was fed. (7) And when he said, "Whom do you seek?"¹⁷ he demonstrates that the ones who seek and "the ones who seek Jesus"¹⁸ (who is interpreted as "healer" and "savior"),¹⁹ are the ones who have been deceived, in order that when they slay him they might cease from the salvation of this man.²⁰

6. Jn 11.34.

7. Lk 8.45.

8. Mk 6.38.

9. Mt 20.21.

10. Jn 18.4. Cf. *Anc.* 38.1-8.

11. Jn 11.34.

12. Cf. 2 Kgs 4.8-37.

13. Cf. Lk 10.38-42.

14. Lk 8.45.

15. Cf. Jn 5.31-47.

16. Mk 6.38.

17. Jn 18.4.

18. Jn 11.56.

19. Cf. Mt 1.21.

20. Cf. Eus., *d.e.* 4.10 (165b-c), on the interpretation of the name "Jesus."

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED NINE

(1) So even as we pointed out the things which are said concerning the economy of our Lord in a human sense, it [the economy] was not without a share of foreknowledge (for someone among those who think rightly ought not say that he, being near the location, is ignorant of where they have buried Lazarus, even if for the reason for which we said he was asking the way, recently being far away from Galilee and pointing out by himself that Lazarus has died). Thus also we resolve reasonably these things concerning the Old Testament. (2) When God said, "Adam where are you?"¹ he was not being ignorant, but demonstrating from what sort of height to what kind of depth of shame Adam has fallen. (3) And [God says], "Where is Abel, your brother?"² because him whom it was necessary for you [Cain] to bear always in your bent arms and to be together always with him, you have cast unto the ground next to you. (4) For he points out from what is being conveyed, that he was asking not on account of ignorance, but convicting him in saying that "the ground is accursed by your deeds, and you are accursed from the ground, which opened its mouth to receive the blood of your brother from your hand."³ For it says, "Behold, his voice cries out to me."⁴ (5) And, "Where is Sarah, your wife?"⁵ he said, not being ignorant. For when was he ignorant, the one who knew that she was laughing in the tent?⁶ Therefore, he was not asking out of ignorance, but in order that he might inspire her "daughters," the ones who "proclaim godly fear,"⁷ to learn the struggle of that woman, whenever they may endeavor to minister to saints out of their own labors. (6) For that woman, taking the initiative in so great a service, herself making unleavened loaves and preparing so great a service together with her own maidservants, was not seeing the faces of those being served, [thus] leaving behind a model of suitable prudence for our times. And these things will suffice as proof against the opposing arguments of the irreverent.

1. Gn 3.9.

2. Gn 4.9.

3. Gn 4.11.

4. Gn 4.10.

5. Gn 18.9.

6. Cf. Gn 18.10-12.

7. 1 Tm 2.10.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED TEN

(1) If they might say that “good” is the God of the law,¹ the one who defrauded the Egyptians and taught his own people to despoil while they were leaving the land of Egypt,² the irreverent do not know that nothing is destroyed by God, and that his judgment is righteous,³ and “God is not mocked.”⁴ (2) For why were the Egyptians believing that the Jews were seeking to do these things without reward and not just for [a few] years, but two hundred fifteen with the two hundred fifteen years of Joseph? (3) For with a sojourn determined to be of four hundred thirty years for Abraham and his seed, as it says, “Your seed will be sojourners in a foreign land,”⁵ that which was determined was completed.⁶ (4) So by his compassion God divided the years of sojourn of his [people]. And forthwith, when they had been in the land of the Canaanites two hundred fifteen years, he laid hold of them and set apart the other two hundred fifteen years for them after they had gone into Egypt.⁷ (5) For the number of these years thus is proportioned. It was then the seventy-fifth year of Abraham. Therefore, there passed from

1. Cf. *Anc.* 108.1; *Pan.* 66.83.1–3.

2. Cf. *Ex* 3.22; 12.36. Cf. *Iren., haer.* 4.30.1–4.

3. Cf. *Acts* 7.7.

4. *Gal* 6.7.

5. *Gn* 15.13.

6. On the problem of the 430 years that resulted from a comparison of *Gn* 15.13, which posited a 400-year stay in Egypt, with *Ex* 12.40, which stated 430 years, see W. Adler, “The *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus and its Jewish Antecedents,” *ZAC* 14.3 (2011): 496–524, especially 501–2.

7. Cf. Anastasius Sinaita, *quaestiones et responsiones* 28. The references Holl made to Anastasius, which I reproduce here, were based on the text in PG 89 (by Jacob Grester in 1617), though subsequent scholarship has since recovered the authentic questions and answers. See M. Richard, “Les véritables ‘Questions et Réponses’ d’Anastase le Sinaïte,” *Bulletin de l’Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes* 14 (1967–69): 39–56; J. Haldon, “The Works of Anastasius of Sinai: A Key Source for the History of Seventh-Century East Mediterranean Society and Belief,” in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam, ed. A. Cameron and L. Conrad (Princeton: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1992), 107–47; M. Richard and J. Munitiz, *Anastasi Sinaitae, Quaestiones et Responsiones*, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 59 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), xvii–lxi.

Abraham's seventy-five years, until the birth of Isaac, twenty-five years. Isaac begets Jacob, deriving sixty years, and eighty-five years have passed. And Jacob, with eighty-nine years having passed, begets Levi, and there were one hundred seventy-four years. Levi, when forty-four years have passed, begets Kohath. And in the forty-seventh year of Levi, Jacob travels down into Egypt, and there passed two hundred eleven years. And after their entrance into Egypt there were another four years, and the two hundred fifteen years are fulfilled.⁸ (6) Thereupon again I count the remaining two hundred fifteen years of the sojourn of the Israelites. Kohath, after the descent into Egypt, in his sixty-fifth year begets the father of Moses, Abraham. Then there passed from the first Abraham, from his seventy-fifth year, until the birth of the last Abraham, two hundred eighty years, but from the descent into Egypt, sixty-five years. (7) Abraham, being seventy years old, begets Moses, and there passed from the first Abraham three hundred fifty years, but from the descent into Egypt, one hundred thirty-five years. (8) Moses, in his thirtieth year, treads the Red Sea, exiting with the Israelites out of Egypt. And there passed from the great Abraham three hundred eighty years, but from the journey down into Egypt, one hundred sixty-five years. (9) They spent the remaining fifty years after the crossing of the Red Sea until the meeting in Palestine, not because of the length of the route, but because of the fighting and being hindered by the peoples found on their route. (10) So there passed from the seventy-fifth year of the great Abraham, from whom the prognostication itself was given to him by God, as far as Moses and the arrival into Palestine of the sons of Israel, four hundred thirty years, but from the journey down into Egypt and until their arrival <into> Palestine, two hundred fifteen years.

8. Julius Africanus, *chronicon* T32 (Walraff); Hipp., *refutatio omnium haeresium* 10.30; Eus., *chronicon* T28b (Walraff). Holl (1915), 134, suggested that Epiphanius had either mishandled his sources or already possessed corrupted versions which led him to calculate 211 years from Abraham's seventy-fifth year until the descent into Egypt, thereby forcing him to intercalate another four years to round out the 215.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED ELEVEN

(1) So for the Israelites, who labored without reward for so many years, was there no just reward to be given by God and men to them upon completion? Therefore, God is not unjust, leading them out of their homes from that place with spoils. (2) But if someone might doubt that the years were not enumerated thus, let him listen to Moses, who says, "the settling of the sons of Israel in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt was four hundred thirty years."¹ (3) So with the most just reward of the Lord being taken care of, what sort of irreverent opposing argument still remains for those who wish to bring down blame against the holy God? No one should at any time blame the true God. But those who blame, blame themselves. (4) Some other irreverent opposing argument is declared by them, similar to the first, that "'Good' is the God of the law, who defrauded the Canaanites, in order that he might give their place to the Israelites," "houses which they did not build, and olive groves and fig-trees and vineyards, which they did not plant."² (5) To whom I will say: O irreverent ones! If God were as a man, what is being said or done today may pass, and nothing of his would be held in esteem. But since God "is God and not a man,"³ he, the avenging one, would not forget for many generations the things which are being brought up against him. For if they are ignorant of this matter, let them learn.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED TWELVE

(1) All know that the righteous Noah became the remnant of the world after the Flood. So as both he and his three sons were left remaining, seeing how he was just and attempting to establish his children as devout, in order that they might fall under the same evils as also those in the Flood, not only through words was he teaching devotion to these men, but also through an oath from each one of them he demanded goodwill toward

1. Ex 12.40.

2. Dt 6.11.

3. Hos 11.9.

[each] brother.¹ (2) And he divided, as an heir of the world, having appointed the entire world under God to his three sons, dividing by inheritances and portioning out each part according to an inheritance for each.² (3) And to Shem, the firstborn, the inheritance fell from Persian and Bactrian land up to <the length> of the Indian land, <and breadth from the Indian land> up to the land of the *Rhinokourouroi*.³ The land of the *Rhinokourouroi* itself lies in the middle of Egypt and Palestine, opposite the Red Sea. (4) To Ham, the second [son], from the same land of the *Rhinokourouroi* up to that of Gades to the south.⁴ To Japheth, the third [son], from Media up to that of Gades and the *Rhinokourouroi* to the north.⁵

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED THIRTEEN

(1) So to Shem there came to be children and twenty-five children of children, up to when the tongues were divided.¹ And they have been scattered about into tongues and tribes and kingdoms. (2) Their names are as follows:² Elymaeans, Paioni-

1. Cf. *Jubilees* 9.14.

2. Cf. *Jubilees* 8.10–17.

3. Cf. Hipp., *chronicon* 47.

4. Cf. Hipp., *chron.* 48.

5. Cf. *Pan.* 66.83.3–8. Also Hipp., *chron.* 49. Williams, *The Panarion*, vol. 2 (1994), 302, n. 411, explains that “Rhinocorura” comes from Epiphanius’s reading of LXX, Is 27.12, which refers to the region stretching from the Euphrates to Egypt. See Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 155–56, on the problems presented by the area of Rhinocorura in Hippolytus.

1. Cf. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 1.143–147; Hipp., *chron.* 158–197; *Chronicon Paschale* 45.3–4 (Dindorf).

2. J. Piilonen, *Hippolytus Romanus, Epiphanius Cypriensis and Anastasius Sinaita: A Study of the ΔΙΑΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ*, Sarja-Ser. B Nide-Tom. 181 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1974), demonstrates that the list here in the surviving manuscripts of the *Anc.* was mangled as a result of copyist errors from the original list written by Epiphanius, and he offers a study of the manuscript tradition and attempts to reconstruct the original order of the list of Semite peoples in 113.2, based upon a reading of Anast. S., *qu. et resp.* 28. I have translated here the (mangled) list as found in Holl’s edition.

Piilonen, *Hippolytus Romanus*, 31–36, suggests that Epiphanius derived much of his lists on the peoples of Shem, Ham, and Japheth from the *Chronicon* of Hippolytus (manuscript type H2), though he also added certain names

ans, *Lazones*, *Kossaiōi*, *Gasphēnoi*, <Palestinians>, Indians, Syrians, Arabs (also [known as] the <*Tai*>*anoi*), Arians, *Mardoi*, *Hyrkanoi*, *Magusaeans*, *Troglodites*, Assyrians, Germans, Lydians, Mesopotamians, Hebrews, *Koilēnoi*, Bactrians, *Adiabēnoi*, *Kamēioi*, Saracens, Scythians, *Chiones*, Gymnosophists, Chaldeans, Parthians, *Eētai*, *Kordylēnoi*, *Massunoi*, Phoenicians, *Madiēnaioi*, *Commagēnoi*, Dardanians, *Elamasēnoi*, *Kedrousiōi*, Elamites, Armenians, Cilicians, <Egyptians>, Cappadocians, <Phoenicians>, people from Pontus, <*Marmaridai*>, *Biones*, <*Kares*>, Chalybes, <*Psyllitai*>, *Lazoi*, <Mossynoikoi>, Iberians, <Phrygians>. (3) To Ham, the second son, there were children and thirty-two children of children, up to the same division of tongues.³ Ethiopians, Troglodytes, *Aggaōi*, *Taiēnoi*, Sabinoi, Fish-eaters, *Hellanikoi*, Egyptians, Phoenicians, *Marmaridai*, Carians, *Psyllitai*, *Mossynoikoi*, Phrygians, *Makōnes*, *Makrōnes*, *Syrtitai*, *Leptimagnitai*, Bithynians, Numidians, Lycians, *Mariandēnoi*, Pamphylians, *Moschesidioi*, Pisidians, *Augalaiōi*, Cilicians, *Maurusioi*, Cretans, *Magardai*, *Noumidoi*, *Aphroi*, and also the *Bizakēnoi*, *Nasamōnes*, *Phasgēnoi*, *Mazikes*, *Garamoi*, *Getouloi*, Blemmyes, *Axōmitai*. These men control [the land] from Egypt up to the Ocean. (4) And their islands are: *Koursoula*, *Lopadousa*, *Gaulos*, *Ridē Melitē*, Corcyra, *Mēnē*, *Sardanis*, *Gortuna*, Crete, *Glaukos*, *Ridē Thera*, *Karianthos*, *Astupalaia*, Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos, Imbros, *Iasos*, Samos, Cos, Cnidus, *Nissuros*, Megisti,

from another source. For a thorough analysis of Hippolytus's lists of peoples and places and his sources for them and how Epiphanius was both a continuator and innovator of Hippolytus, see Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 135-59, 168-76. W. Adler, however, in "The Origins of the Proto-Heresies: Fragments From a Chronicle in the First Book of Epiphanius's *Panarion*," *JTS* 41.2 (1990): 472-501, especially 496-98, argues that Epiphanius was drawing on a source in the Christian chronographic tradition that included elements of *Jubilees*, Julius Africanus, and the *diamerismos* tradition.

For the following lists of names, I have used Anglicized (following Liddell and Scott, Lampe) names for commonly known peoples, while I have transliterated from the Greek (in italics) the names of uncertain or obscure peoples and names which have been misspelled or altered in Epiphanius's lists. For the peoples of Shem, cf. *Chron. Pasch.* 54.1-56.5 (Dindorf). The numerous conjectured additions, indicated in the *apparatus criticus*, were based on Holl's reading of the PG text of Anastasius Sinaita.

3. For the peoples of Ham, cf. Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* 1.130-139; Hipp., *chron.* 92-157; *Chron. Pasch.* 45.2-3. 51.4-52.7 (Dindorf).

and Cyprus.⁴ (5) And to Japheth, the third son, there were children and fifteen children of children, up to the same division of tongues.⁵ Medes, Albanians, *Gargianoï*, Armenians, *Arraioi*, Amazons, *Kōloi*, *Korzēnoi*, *Beneagēnoi*, Cappadocians, Galatians, Paphlagonians, *Mariandēnoi*, *Tibarēnoi*, Chalybes, Mossynoikoi, Colchians, *Melagchēnoi*, Sarmatians, Germans, Maeotians, Scythians, *Tauroi*, Thracians, *Basternoi*, Illyrians, Macedonians, Hellenes, Libyans, Phrygians, Pannonians, *Istroï*, *Ouennoi*, *Dauneis*, Iapygians, Calabrians, *Hippikoi*, Latins (also [known as] the Romans), Tyrrhenians, Gauls (also [known as] <the> Celts), Ligurians, <Campanians>, Celtic-Iberians, Iberians, Gauls, Aquitanians, Illyrians, *Basantes*, *Kannioi*, *Kartanoi*, Lusitanians, *Ouakkaioi*, Britons, Skotoi, Spaniards. (6) And their islands are: Britain, Sicily, Euboea, Rhodes, Chios, Lesbos, Cythera, Zakynthos, Cephallenia, Ithaca, Corcyra, Cyprus.⁶ (7) If somewhere a name of a people or an island has been registered doubly, in an inheritance of one and again of another, according to the common territories or according to settlements which came to be at some opportunity or according to an acquisition of Ham, who claimed more and took a part of Shem's, let no one wonder or doubt.⁷

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED FOURTEEN

(1) Therefore, when these peoples thus had come to be from the three sons of Noah, and when the world had been divided into three for the three sons, as I stated before, an oath was demanded from them by their father that no one tread upon the inheritance of his brother. (2) They said in the oath that the one who transgresses the command of the oath and all his seed are to be destroyed utterly.¹ (3) So when Palestine and all that

4. Cf. Hipp., *chron.* 153; *Chron. Pasch.* 53.3-7. On the island tradition, see Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 148-49.

5. For the peoples of Japheth, cf. Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* 1.122-129; Hipp., *chron.* 56-91; *Chron. Pasch.* 45.1-2, 47.13-48.2 (Dindorf).

6. Cf. Hipp., *chron.* 88; *Chron. Pasch.* 48.27-49.3 (Dindorf).

7. Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 171, remarks that this statement was quite important, for it was the first time in the Christian ethnographic tradition where an author recognized the incoherence that emerged from the overlap of Greek ethnographic lists with the descendants of Noah derived from Genesis 10.

1. Cf. *Jubilees* 9.14-15.

is near it fell under into the share <of> Shem, Canaan the son of Ham, being greedy, later attacked the land of the Palestinians, that is Judaea, and was snatching it away.² (4) And God was patient, giving time for repentance, in order that those [born] of Ham might repent and give back to the people of Shem their own apportionment of land. But those people were not repenting but were wishing to fill up their measure. (5) Then God, who is just, after many subsequent generations, avenges the transgression of the oath. For thus it was necessary that the measure of the Amorites be paid in full.³ (6) For Shem begets Arpachshad. Ham begets Canaan, and Canaan begets, after the greedy gain, the Amorite and the Gergashite and *Pherezaion* and *Euaion* and *Aroukaion* and *Aradion* and Sidonian people.⁴ (7) Therefore, the generations up to the avenging of Shem thus are accounted. Shem, the one who was defrauded, begets Arpachshad, as we said. Arpachshad begets Cainan, Cainan [begets] Shelah, Shelah Eber, and the building of the tower happens.⁵ Eber begets Peleg, and the division of the earth and of tongues happens. Peleg begets Reu, <Reu> Serug, Serug Nahor, Nahor Terah, Terah Abraham, Abraham Isaac, Isaac Jacob, the one named Israel, from whom are the Israelites. Jacob [begets] Judah, Judah Perez, Perez Hezron, Hezron Aram, Aram Aminadab, Aminadab Nahshon, and Nahshon Salmon. This is the lineage of those who have been born from Shem.⁶ (8) So these men, who were wronged by the sons of Ham and deprived of

2. Cf. *Jubilees* 10.29–34. Inglebert, *Interpretatio Christiana*, 118–19, explains that *Jubilees* added this element of conquest as a supplement to the traditional Jewish interpretation of Genesis 10 in order to accommodate a Greek geographic scheme of three continents with the ethnographic scheme of the scriptural narrative of the earth divided among Noah's three sons. This geographic conception was then used to explain and justify the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. Adler, "The Origins," 490–93, discusses how Christian chronographers, beginning with Julius Africanus, drew on the *Jubilees* tradition to counter the criticism that God seemed unjust in the retribution against the Canaanites. Epiphanius also later revived this argument in his refutation of the Manichaean charge that the God of the Old Testament was unjust, in *Pan.* 66.83.1–84.3.

3. Cf. Gn 15.16.

4. Cf. Gn 10.15–31.

5. Again as above in *Anc.* 59.4, I have adopted orthographic conventions from the NRSV.

6. Cf. Gn 11.10–26; Lk 3.32–36; Mt 1.2–4. Cf. *Pan.* 66.84.5–6.

their own place, God avenges, having utterly destroying those of Canaan according to their oath, and the seed of Shem recovers its own land. So God did not do wrong, portioning out just things to each share. "For God is not mocked,"⁷ as I said before.

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED FIFTEEN

(1) So in the Exodus, binding the community to himself, God says to Moses, "loosen the sandals from your feet."¹ For all who intend to come near to purification baths first loosen [their sandals]. (2) Therefore, since much time has passed, and every single one, "strayed in his own way,"² and this community remained in its own evils, God was not yet revealing "the water of new birth."³ But he was delaying for many years, and later he revealed to the holy church the all-holy water. (3) He was loosening the sandals in Moses, removing the outside garment in the prophets, having left only the girdle for Jeremiah,⁴ <and> in John having exchanged all the garments of the world, he was fashioning one from camel hair.⁵ But in the Savior himself and to his disciples he put off the "form of the world."⁶ And from heaven on high after the purification of the waters, he has put on a garment "of fire and of spirit."⁷ (4) But although they saw the grace of this, the Israelites did not know that he is God. On which account also the prophet by way of accusation was lamenting these people on account of the future disgrace [to be committed] by them against the Savior, saying: "Do you repay these things to the Lord, foolish and heartless people?"⁸ (5) For they did not know him, that he was in the beginning with whom <the> Father counseled together, saying, "Let us make man according to our image and according to our likeness."⁹ (6) For the "Let us make" is not indicative of the number one. But at any rate the Father counseled together with the Son

7. Gal 6.7.

1. Ex 3.5.

2. Is 53.6.

3. Cf. Ti 3.5.

4. Cf. Jer 13.1-7.

5. Cf. Mt 3.4.

6. 1 Cor 7.31.

7. Cf. Mt 3.11.

8. Dt 32.6. Cf. *Anc.* 3.2-3, 27.4.

9. Gn 1.26.

GENERAL INDEX

- Abraham, 103-4, 118, 123, 135,
144-45, 151, 153, 191-92, 208,
211-12, 217, 219
- activity, 18n50, 21, 23, 24n73, 63,
91, 152, 160n1, 162
- Adam, 43, 81, 91-92, 103, 117,
141-43, 146-48, 175, 189-90,
208, 210
- alien, 67n9, 83, 139; Son is not,
60, 68, 72, 134-35; Spirit is not,
68-69, 73-74, 79-80, 83, 85,
222
- allegorize, to, 43, 130, 137-38,
142-43, 146-47
- allegory, allegorical, 8, 43-44,
130n4, 135-36, 143, 147n1, 148
- Apollinarius of Laodicea,
Apollinarian(s), 4, 8, 10n25, 29,
34-42, 46, 61n11, 82, 118n4,
169n7, 171n1, 171n5, 172n6,
176n10
- apostle, 42, 57, 58-59, 75, 79,
83-84, 99, 112, 121, 123, 126,
131-32, 137-38, 140, 144, 149,
165, 172, 174-75, 179, 187,
207, 220, 222, 224, 226
- appearance, 43, 47, 76, 106,
110-11, 113, 120, 147, 150,
160, 169, 176, 190, 193n4,
194-95
- Arian(s), Ariomaniacs, 17-18, 20,
22, 23-24, 26, 30, 36n125, 60,
63n9, 67n9, 82, 101, 106n2,
113, 134, 149, 220-21
- Arius, 17, 20n58, 65n24, 65n27,
66n5, 80, 88, 102, 109, 122n1,
124n1, 128n4
- Athanasius/Athanasios of Alex-
andria, 4, 7, 14, 16, 18, 19n57,
22-28, 32, 33n116, 36, 46, 54,
62n3, 62n4, 64n13, 65n24,
67n6, 70n10, 70n13, 71n15,
72n1, 75n4, 75n5, 86n8, 101n9,
114n7, 122n1
- authority, 12, 22, 87, 94-95, 104,
111-12, 132, 150, 166, 177, 198
- Ayres, Lewis, 17n47, 18n50, 19n51,
19n57, 21, 22n63, 22n65,
23n66, 23n67, 24n78, 25n81,
27n89, 27n89, 28n92, 29n94,
29n96, 33n116, 67n6, 70n10,
83n3, 118n4, 125n5, 129n2
- baptism, 69, 74n17, 141, 222, 224,
226
- baptize, 69, 73-74, 150, 156-57,
167, 177, 221
- Basil of Ancyra, 26n86, 28, 31n106
- Basil of Caesarea, 4, 6n10, 16,
26-30, 32-33, 35n119, 36n125,
64n13, 72n1, 74n17, 118n4,
122n1, 125n5, 127n7
- beget, begotten, 124-25, 128,
130, 133, 143-44, 162, 165,
193, 196, 204, 212, 217; Christ/
Logos/Son, 31, 62, 64, 66, 70-
71, 88, 90, 94, 105, 115, 120,
126, 134-35, 176, 220, 223-25;
God the Father begets Son,
62, 64-66, 70, 90, 105, 122,
128-30, 132, 134-35. *See also*
Only-begotten, only-begotten
- Behr, John, 17n47, 17n48, 18n49,
19n51, 19n52, 24n78, 25n81,
34n118, 36n122, 36n123,
37n127, 42n156, 114n7, 122n1,
137n3, 139n10, 176n10
- blaspheme, to, 25, 31, 62, 66, 74,
82, 86, 93-94, 101, 148, 159,
208, 220-21

- blasphemy, 53, 62, 74, 84, 86, 88,
100, 130-32, 150, 168
- body, bodies, 38-39, 43-44, 51,
73, 111, 113-14, 128, 130,
136-40, 144-45, 147, 151-52,
154, 157, 166, 172-73, 178,
180-87, 189-91, 194-97, 220;
of Christ/*Logos*/Son, 21n61, 36,
39, 40n145, 110, 113, 114n7,
133-34, 141-42, 147-48, 151,
171, 173, 176, 184, 187-89,
221, 225-26
- Christ, Jesus, 55, 64, 74, 76, 78,
81, 89, 90n5, 93, 101, 105n13,
110n2, 123, 126-27, 132,
141, 151, 154, 156-58, 161,
164-66, 171-72, 176-77, 191,
199-200, 222; Apollinarian
view of, 36-42, 149; Arian view
of, 31, 122n1; and baptism, 74,
156-57; as genuine (*γνήσιος*)
Son, 62, 65-66, 88-89, 94, 103,
165; as God, 59-60, 150, 154,
159-60, 170, 174; humanity of,
35-42, 47, 76, 106-7, 122n1,
134, 175, 190; Lord, 60, 121,
123, 145, 150, 158-60, 172,
176, 221, 223, 225-27; as me-
diator, 19, 126, 152; as natural
(*φυσικός*) Son, 66, 126, 131; and
resurrection, 8, 189; and salva-
tion, 30, 58, 150-51; sent, 59,
64n13, 156; Son of God, 59, 99,
119, 153, 161, 177, 221; as Son
of Man, 107, 111, 116-19. *See*
also alien; appearance; body; cre-
ate, created; creation; divinity;
flesh; Incarnation; *Logos*; mind;
nature; Only-begotten, only-
begotten; *parousia*; soul
- Christology, Christological, 16,
34-36, 67n9, 107n9, 122n1,
153n15
- church, 6, 10n24, 12, 14, 22n64,
30n103, 45-46, 53-54, 69, 75,
83, 95, 119, 135, 148-49, 160,
165, 171n1, 173, 179, 199, 207,
218-20, 222, 224, 226-27
- circumcision, 156-57, 166, 196,
220
- coalescence, 47, 64-66, 68-69, 78,
129-30, 177-78
- confess, confessed, 22n64, 25,
32n115, 37, 63, 67n8, 67n9, 76,
80, 82, 113, 117, 119, 127-28,
138, 177, 183-84, 190, 207,
209, 219, 224, 227
- confession, 5, 29, 37, 41, 67n9,
121, 155n11, 167, 179
- Council, 18; of Constantinople,
21, 26n86, 33, 46, 222n4; of
Nicaea, 18, 46, 67n6
- create, created, 21, 23-24, 43,
63-64, 70, 71n13, 74, 85,
94-97, 122, 124, 125n1, 130,
133, 135, 139, 141, 148, 151,
160, 162-63, 169, 225n10;
Christ/*Logos*/Son is not created,
122n1, 124n1, 125, 127-28,
132-33, 168; Spirit is not cre-
ated, 64n13, 71, 162, 168
- creation, 8, 18n50, 19, 21n62,
43, 79, 85, 96, 160, 180, 219,
221-22; Christ/Son is not, 31,
122n1, 132; Spirit is not, 22n64,
32n115
- creator, Creator, 24, 102-3, 163,
169n6, 208
- creature, created thing(s), 64,
70n10, 74, 96, 98, 101, 127-30,
133, 163, 166, 168-69; Son is
not, 122n1, 130; Spirit is not,
22-24, 26, 29, 69n4, 83n3, 94
- David, 80, 90, 92, 104, 110, 131,
144-45, 151-53, 155, 165, 219
- Dechow, Jon, 4n4, 11n26, 12n29,
13n36, 37n127, 43, 137n3,
139n10, 147n1
- DelCogliano, Mark, 22n65, 23n66,
23n67, 27n89, 32n115, 33n116,
64n13, 65n28, 66n1, 69n4,
70n10, 70n13, 71n14, 72n1,
73n13, 83n3, 89n3, 122n1,
122n2, 125n1, 127n7, 168n2
- Devil, 53-54, 63, 86, 93, 97, 116,
169
- Dimoerites, 35, 82, 149
- disciple(s), 29, 59, 76, 105, 107,
115-16, 121, 132, 141, 148-49,
167, 188, 199-200, 218

- divinity, of Christ/*Logos*/Son,
 7, 23n68, 38, 40, 60n16, 68,
 86, 88, 90, 94, 101, 103, 105,
 109-15, 119, 121, 122n1,
 128-29, 132, 134-35, 141, 146,
 148, 152, 153n15, 169, 173-76,
 188-91, 226; of God/Father,
 66, 134, 178; of Spirit, 21n60,
 22, 26-27, 31-32, 55, 61n12,
 64n13, 68, 69n4, 71n17, 73-74,
 75n5, 77, 86n3, 160-61, 168n2;
 of Trinity, 63, 68, 72n1, 74, 78,
 87n2, 94, 97, 101-2, 155, 166,
 177-78
- economy, 30, 39-40, 47, 59, 101,
 104-5, 108-10, 112, 115, 122n1,
 124-25, 132, 151-52, 169, 171,
 174, 181, 185, 191, 210, 219
- enhypostatic, 38, 40, 47, 67, 78,
 89, 155, 165, 167, 169, 172,
 175, 177, 191
- err, to, 38, 56, 101, 137, 168, 172,
 188
- error, erroneous, 8, 35n121, 44,
 91, 110, 163, 168, 170, 189,
 200, 207-8, 214n2
- eternal, eternality, 65n22, 66,
 95-96, 99, 105, 109, 134-35,
 169n6, 195
- Eustathius of Sebaste, 26n86,
 28-30, 31n107
- everlasting, 51, 60, 147, 154, 194,
 226
- face, 97, 106-7, 114, 118, 139,
 156, 194, 210
- Father, and Christ/*Logos*/Son, 4,
 17-19, 26n86, 39-40, 43n157,
 44-45, 60-66, 68, 70-78, 84-91,
 93-95, 96, 99, 101-6, 108,
 111-13, 115-24, 126-34, 148,
 150, 152, 154-55, 158, 160-62,
 164-69, 174-78, 187, 191, 209,
 218, 221, 223, 225-27; and the
 Spirit, 21n61, 21n62, 23, 31-32,
 33n116, 56n2, 63, 68-69, 71-78,
 84-87, 91, 94-95, 96, 99, 102,
 154, 159, 161, 164-69, 177-78,
 223, 226-27; and the Trinity,
 23n68, 26, 51, 53, 57-58, 60-61,
 67-75, 78, 84-87, 91, 94-99,
 102, 129, 149-50, 155-56,
 160-62, 164-69, 220-22
- flesh, 44, 112, 126, 147-48, 151,
 154, 156, 159, 166, 170, 174,
 179, 181-84, 186, 190, 197-98,
 227n32; of Christ/*Logos*/
 Son, 38-40, 76, 90, 99-100,
 104-6, 109-10, 112-14, 116,
 119, 121-22, 125-26, 131-32,
 145-46, 148, 151-53, 159,
 169-70, 173-76, 184, 188-91,
 198, 221, 223, 225-26
- Hanson, Richard, 14, 17n47,
 18n49, 19n51, 19n54, 19n55,
 19n56, 20n58, 20n59, 21n60,
 21n61, 22n65, 24n77, 25n81,
 26, 27n87, 27n89, 33n116,
 37n127, 70n13, 129n2
- Hellenes, 142, 179, 181-84, 199,
 204, 216
- heresiarch, 75, 180n1
- heresiology, heresiological, 15, 42,
 81n11
- heresy, heresies, 4, 10n25, 12-16,
 26, 29, 43n159, 44-45, 51,
 74n1, 75, 80-83, 139n10, 149,
 179, 182, 184, 224, 227
- heretic(s), heretical, 6, 10, 12, 14,
 16, 31, 33n116, 35-36, 42, 53,
 67n9, 70n10, 81n11, 109, 113,
 117, 127, 133, 135, 139n10,
 155n11, 171n1, 171n5, 177,
 178n10, 178n13, 180n1, 182,
 208
- Heteroousian(s), 61n15, 67n7,
 70n11, 71n14, 102n9, 122n1,
 128n7
- Holl, Karl, 8-9, 10n25, 46, 51n1,
 68n14, 72n4, 77n2, 93n1,
 107n9, 125n4, 146n4, 202n2,
 203n5, 203n7, 204n8, 211n7,
 212n8, 214n2, 214n2, 222n4,
 223n5, 223n7, 222n2, 225n9
- Homoian(s), 25, 28, 30n103
- Homoiousian(s), 22n64, 25n81,
 26-28, 31n106
- homoousios*, 22n64, 31, 36, 47,
 62n4, 66-68, 89n3, 99n1, 150,
 178n13, 223, 225

- humanity, 8, 19, 35-36, 40-42,
64n13, 76, 80n9, 97, 116, 119,
122n1, 126, 153, 169, 189-90,
226
- hypostasis/hypostaseis*, 19-21, 25,
31-32, 34, 37-38, 39n138, 41,
45, 47, 67, 69, 70n9, 72n1, 89,
118n4, 155-56, 169, 170n4,
172-73, 177-78, 224, 227
- image, 16n46, 43n157, 83, 120n7,
127n7, 129n2, 143; Christ is, of
the Father, 89, 102; of God in
man, 8, 79, 102, 138-41, 143,
218
- impassibility, 112, 114, 124n9, 176
- impassible, 112, 114, 153, 176,
188, 190-91
- incarnate, 38n134, 39-41, 47, 51,
58, 80-81, 97n1, 101, 109, 111,
114, 120, 122n1, 124, 132, 141,
167, 171
- incarnate, to become/man, to
become, 169, 171, 174, 177,
223, 225-26
- Incarnation, 7, 19, 21, 39, 40, 42,
46, 57, 59n1, 64n13, 81n11, 82,
105n10, 107, 110n6, 119n6,
167, 171, 173-74, 176n11
- incarnational, 4, 39n138, 172n6
- incomprehensibility, 85-86, 105,
108, 114
- incomprehensible, incomprehen-
sibly, 68, 70-71, 106, 114, 124,
128-29, 139, 141-42, 147, 166,
176, 178
- inconceivable, 139, 141, 160, 163,
166, 177
- incorruptible, 129, 146-47, 166,
176, 188, 193
- incorruption, 129, 146-47, 176,
187-88, 196
- indescribable, indescribably, 70,
166, 178
- indivisible, 26, 60n14, 129n4, 140
- ineffable, 106, 114, 129, 135
- infinite, 70, 80, 124, 129, 137,
141, 163, 166
- invisible, 77, 79, 108, 119, 124,
136, 139, 141, 163, 166, 177,
223, 225
- Jacob, 92, 118, 123, 131-32, 144,
192, 194, 212, 217
- Jews, Jewish, 20n59, 51, 60, 81n11,
83, 97, 100-101, 127, 211,
217n2, 219-20
- judgment, 44, 51, 84n2, 86n5,
87n2, 93-94, 137, 148, 163,
184-86, 194-96, 211, 226
- kingdom, 79, 90, 98, 123, 127,
132, 214, 223, 226
- knowledge, 5, 7, 10, 76, 84-88,
91-96, 99-100, 107, 110, 116,
121, 164, 166, 181n1, 185, 191,
200
- Kösters, Oliver, 4n4, 5, 6n10,
7n14, 7n15, 7n16, 8-9, 11n26,
30n105, 31, 34, 36n123,
37n127, 38n134, 38n137,
39n143, 41n151, 46-47, 51n2,
51n3, 53n1, 53n2, 55n1, 56n3,
59n10, 60n14, 60n16, 64n13,
64n21, 67n9, 68n14, 71n15,
72n1, 72n4, 73n13, 75n4, 77n2,
77n5, 82n4, 101n7, 102n1,
105n13, 107n9, 119n6, 128n1,
130n4, 131n1, 153n15, 155n10,
155n13, 156n18, 169n7, 170n3,
171n1, 176n11, 177n9, 178n13,
193n4, 222n4
- Laminski, Adolf, 21n60, 22n64,
22n65, 23n68, 23n69, 23n70,
24n74, 71n15, 75n4, 85n9
- law, 77, 80-81, 140, 151-52, 155,
165-66, 175-76, 179, 191-92,
205, 208-9, 211, 213, 226
- Lazarus, 107, 116-17, 189, 196,
198, 209-10
- Logos*, 21, 39-40, 42, 47, 84-87,
89-91, 97, 99, 102, 103n13,
105-6, 108-10, 113-16, 123-
25, 128-29, 132, 134-35, 142,
147, 152-53, 159-61, 167,
169, 173-75, 177, 189-91, 199,
226
- Lord's-man (*κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος*),
110, 115, 125, 173, 190
- Lucian, Lucianists, 18n49, 81, 109,
113

- Macedonians, 26-27
 man, to become. *See* incarnate, to become/man, to become
 Mani, Manichaeans, 8, 82, 109-10, 129-30, 136, 149, 182, 208, 217n2
 Marcellus of Ancyra, 18, 21, 37n128, 64n21, 67n9, 90n5, 122n1
 Mary, 10n25, 38, 40, 76, 82, 90, 105-6, 108, 119, 125-26, 131-33, 145, 147, 153, 169, 174-76, 184, 187, 189, 223, 225
 Meletius, 25, 28, 31n107, 122n1
 mind, 38-43, 51, 57, 84, 108, 123-24, 129, 138, 140, 168, 170-74, 199, 227; of Christ, 35, 38-41, 149, 170-75, 225, 173
 mononym, mononymic, 47, 72-73, 95, 99n3, 118n4
 Morales, Xavier, 19n55, 19n56, 20n59, 22n65, 23n68, 24n73, 24n77, 24n78, 25n81, 26n82, 62n3, 62n4, 65n25, 70n13, 72n1, 75n4, 77n3, 83n3, 86n8, 122n1, 125n1
 Moses, 61, 64, 68, 80, 104, 114-15, 117, 135, 141, 147-48, 153-54, 166, 192-95, 199-200, 212-13, 218
 nature, 7, 42, 69n4, 105, 125, 129, 141, 152, 193, 227n29; of God, 106, 134-36; of Holy Spirit, 20n59, 22, 24, 26, 46, 162n3; of Son/Christ, 17, 19, 38n134, 45, 90, 105, 110n2, 114, 126, 131-32, 135, 153, 169, 225n10, 226n14
 Nautin, Pierre, 4n4, 12n29, 14
 Only-begotten, only-begotten, 21n62, 58-62, 65, 68, 72-73, 78, 93-94, 99-100, 112, 121, 123, 130-36, 152, 161-62, 169, 177-78, 223, 225
 Origen, Origenist(s), 3n3, 4, 8, 13, 16n46, 20n59, 42-46, 66n1, 82, 129n2, 137, 139n10, 147-49, 184
 orthodox, orthodoxy, 4-5, 10, 12-14, 18, 19n57, 20, 22, 24, 26-34, 36-37, 42, 45, 51, 57-59, 67n6, 83, 106, 133, 199, 222, 224, 227
ousia, 19, 20n58, 26, 34, 47, 62n4, 67n9, 68, 71, 73, 78, 102, 105n13, 106n2, 113, 119, 129-30, 155, 177-78, 183, 193, 220, 222-25, 227
Panarion, 3-4, 8-10, 15-16, 30-31, 33, 35-37, 39-45, 81n11, 137n3, 177n9
 Paradise, 43, 91-92, 103, 137-38, 142-43, 146-47, 151
parousia, 40, 47, 51, 58, 80-81, 101, 109, 111, 120, 132, 150, 167, 171, 175, 191
 passion, 109, 112-14, 126, 128-30, 189-91, 201
 Paul (Apostle), 41, 75, 77, 79, 83, 126, 132, 137-38, 157-58, 165, 172, 174-75, 187, 207, 222
 Paul of Samosata, 61n11, 64n21, 67n6, 82, 101n6
 Paulinus, 25, 37, 42
 Person(s) of the Trinity, 24n73, 31, 33n116, 35, 47, 59n10, 67n9, 68n10, 69n7, 72n1, 74n17, 87n2, 97, 112, 116-18, 155-56
 Peter (Apostle), 59, 74-76, 79, 110-12, 119, 125-26, 159, 190, 222
 Pneumatology, 20, 22n65, 24, 26n82, 27n89, 29n94, 31, 32n115, 33n116, 36n125
 Pneumatomachoi, 6-7, 17n48, 22n64, 26-32, 33n116, 53n5, 56n3, 58n2, 64n13, 70n10, 82, 149, 150n1
 pro-Nicene(s), 17n48, 19n57, 22n63, 24, 27, 33n116, 65n22, 101n6, 177n9
 prophet, 63, 99-101, 108, 135-36, 149-50, 152, 164-66, 169, 179, 185, 192, 194, 208-9, 218-19, 224, 226
 resurrection, 8, 36, 43n157, 44, 46, 51, 57-58, 118, 120,

- resurrection (*cont.*)
 148-49, 167, 179-80, 181n2,
 182-84, 186-89, 191-99, 224,
 226-27
 Riggi, Calogero, 3n1, 4n5, 5n9,
 6n10, 10n25, 11n28, 15n43,
 15n45, 222n4, 224n2
 righteousness, 40-41, 83, 125,
 127, 151-52, 155

 Sabellius, Sabellians, 8, 29, 37,
 47n165, 64n21, 67, 82, 86n9,
 88, 118n4, 149, 171n5, 178n10,
 220-21
 salvation, 36, 51, 55, 58, 59n1,
 96, 101, 106, 112, 114, 122n1,
 142, 147, 155, 167, 169,
 172-73, 179, 188, 190-91,
 197, 199, 203, 206, 209, 223,
 225
 savior, 56-57, 76, 82, 84, 111-13,
 126, 133, 135-36, 138, 141,
 147-48, 150-51, 159-60, 167,
 169, 174, 187, 189, 192, 208-9,
 218-19
 Scripture(s), 8, 11, 19, 22n64, 27,
 32, 39, 41, 43, 51, 58-59, 62,
 73n13, 80, 84-85, 88-89, 91-
 94, 100, 104, 105n1, 108-10,
 112-13, 121, 122n1, 125, 127,
 136, 138-40, 143-44, 147, 149,
 154-56, 160, 163, 167, 170-72,
 186-89, 191, 199, 222-23
 Semi-Arians, 17n48, 31n106, 82
 sin, sinful, 39-40, 44, 74, 80n9, 85,
 93, 116, 140, 150-52, 154, 157,
 164, 166, 171-75, 184-86, 195,
 224-25
 soul, 38-39, 43n157, 44, 51, 55,
 57, 73-74, 85, 91, 97, 100,
 129-30, 138-40, 143-44, 147,
 154, 157, 166, 172-73, 178,
 182-86, 196-97, 199, 226; in
 Christ, 36, 38-40, 109-13, 125,
 148, 169-71, 173, 175-76, 221,
 225
 Spirit, Holy, 4, 6-8, 20-33, 44-46,
 51, 53, 55, 56n2, 57-61, 63,
 64n13, 67-78, 80, 82-87, 91,
 94-99, 102, 106, 118, 120n7,
 123, 129, 132, 145, 148-50,
 152, 154-62, 164-69, 177-78,
 191, 199, 208, 219-23, 225-27;
 as co-creator, 85, 97, 169;
 is God, 68, 73, 75, 159; in
 baptism, 73, 74n17, 156, 167,
 177, 221; not begotten, 71; not
 created, 71, 162, 168; Paraclete,
 21, 73, 161, 165, 226; proceed-
 ing from Father, 68-69, 73, 78,
 154, 165, 223, 226; procession
 of, 75n4; receiving from the
 Son, 68-69, 73, 78, 154, 165,
 226; sanctifying, 23, 69n4, 156;
 seal, sealing, 23, 69n7, 74, 95,
 158; searches the depths of
 God, 69, 80, 83-85, 222; "Spirit
 of Christ," 155, 161, 164; "Spirit
 of God," 61, 68, 73, 75, 78, 80,
 82-83, 94, 123, 157-59, 161,
 164, 226; "Spirit of the Lord,"
 63, 153, 157-58; "Spirit of
 truth," 61, 63, 69n4, 73, 159,
 161-62, 164-65, 177-78; in
 Trinity, 58, 60-61, 63, 67-72,
 77-78, 85, 87, 94-95, 97-99,
 102, 150, 155, 167, 178, 222;
 uncreated, 94, 226
 suffer, suffering, 40, 111-12, 114,
 126, 130-32, 151, 153, 176,
 188-91, 197, 223, 226

 Trinity, 7, 17, 24n73, 31, 33n116,
 45, 47, 53, 56, 60, 63, 67n9,
 68-70, 72n1, 74, 75n4, 78, 85,
 95, 97, 99, 150, 154-55, 160n1,
 167, 177, 222
 Tropikoi, 22-27, 58n2, 86n3

 unbegotten, 63n9, 65n22, 70,
 71n14, 71n15
 unbeliever, 93, 179-81, 183, 187,
 193, 199, 220
 uncreated, 95, 97, 133; God the
 Father is, 94, 124; Son is, 64, 71,
 94, 134, 168, 177; Spirit is, 94,
 177, 226
 unwilling, unwillingly, 58, 134-35,
 150

 vainglorious, 83, 112, 122, 128,
 134, 167, 186, 195, 199

visible, 79, 108, 138-39, 155, 166,
198, 223, 225

will, 21, 59n1, 71n14, 87, 93, 109,
111, 134, 148, 191, 222

willing, willingly, 56, 58, 111,
134-35, 182, 189

wisdom, 40, 79, 83, 86-87, 90,

107, 111, 116, 119-20, 123-24,

152, 161, 164, 174, 191

without beginning (*ἀναρχος*), 62,

105, 122, 128

worship, 7, 31-32, 69n7, 97, 103-4,

115-16, 132-34, 156, 160, 163,

191, 201-4, 207, 223

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL ALLUSIONS AND CITATIONS

The following table includes all biblical references, both quoted directly and implied indirectly, in the *Ancoratus*. The chapter and verse references correspond with their location(s) in the text of Holl/Dummer that follows each colon. "Letter 1" and "Letter 2" refer to the appended letters from Pamphylia to Epiphanius, while "Letter 3, intro." refers to Epiphanius's salutation preceding the "formal" numbering of the *Ancoratus*. The numbering for the Psalms follows the ordering of the Septuagint and Vulgate, and Epiphanius's particular references from the Septuagint are indicated by LXX.

Old Testament

Genesis

1.1: 15.7, 55.2
1.1-27: 55.2
1.3: 67.7
1.26: 15.7, 28.1,
28.2, 28.3, 28.4,
29.1, 55.3, 55.4,
55.5, 115.5
1.27: 11.7
2.6: 58.1
2.7: 35.5, 35.6, 55.8,
55.9
2.8: 58.1
2.10: 58.1
2.10-11: 58.2
2.11: 58.2
2.13: 58.3
2.14: 58.4, 58.5
2.23: 62.9
2.25: 20.2
3.6: 20.3
3.8: 29.3
3.9: 38.7, 108.1,
109.2
3.11: 38.7
4.1: 20.5

4.9: 38.8, 108.1,
109.3
4.10-11: 38.8
4.10: 94.4, 109.4
4.11: 109.4
5.3: 59.1
5.6-32: 59.1
5.24: 94.4, 98.6
6.13: 29.4
7.1: 29.4
9.12: 29.4
10.15-31: 114.6
11.10-26: 59.4,
114.7
12.7: 53.2
15.13: 110.3
15.16: 114.5
18.1-3: 29.5
18.9: 39.4, 108.1,
109.5
18.10-12: 109.5
18.12: 39.5
18.17: 29.6
18.20: 29.6
18.33: 29.6, 29.7
19.1: 29.7

19.24: 29.7, 115.7
29.21-32: 20.7
30.22: 20.8
49.3-4: 97.1
49.29-30: 94.7
50.25: 94.8

Exodus

3.2: 53.2
3.5: 115.1
3.6: 94.9
3.14: 5.5, 39.1
3.22: 110.1
4.2: 39.1, 96.1
4.3: 96.1
12.36: 110.1
12.40: 111.2
13.19: 94.8
30.22-25: 66.8
31.3: 43.2

Numbers

11.4-6: 116.8
16.1-40: 99.1
17.1-8: 95.1-2

Deuteronomy

6.4: 6.7, 50.4, 70.3
 6.11: 111.4
 19.15: 9.13, 10.1
 28.12: 18.4
 32.2: 66.3
 32.6: 115.4
 32.43: 29.8, 37.4
 33.6: 97.4, 97.8

1 Samuel

2.26: 18.4
 9.2: 18.4
 15.29: 48.7

2 Samuel

23.2: 68.12

1 Kings

1.1-2: 20.8
 1.3-4: 20.8
 3.3-14: 43.2
 17.17-24: 92.4, 98.3
 22.21-22: 72.4

2 Kings

2.1: 98.6
 4.8-37: 98.3, 108.4
 4.32-37: 92.4
 13.21: 92.4

1 Chronicles

29.11: 37.5, 37.7

Job

8.2: 72.5
 12.11: 76.7
 14.12: 99.3
 14.14: 99.2
 19.26: 99.2
 28.12: 42.7
 38.28: 71.3

Psalms (LXX
numbering)

5.2: 79.5
 7.10: 81.3
 10.6: 72.5
 11.5: Letter 1.2
 15.10: 34.1, 91.5
 17.2: 50.5

32.6: 15.8, 24.6,
 70.1, 115.6

42.3: 67.7
 45.4: 19.2
 46.4-5: 49.5
 49.23: 23.4
 58.6: 70.6
 67.7: 99.2
 71.6: 66.3
 72.8: Letter 1.2
 76.3: 80.6
 77.39: 72.3
 80.10: 70.3
 81.6: 71.3
 87.5: 34.2
 88.7: 49.3
 93.9: 40.7
 93.9-10: 31.8
 93.10: 40.7
 96.7: 50.5
 102.5: 99.2
 102.16: 72.3, 99.3
 103.4: 72.1
 103.29: 72.3
 103.30: 68.2
 104.8: 65.5
 106.22: 23.4
 109.1: 30.1, 116.4
 120.4: 31.2
 129.1: 12.6
 142.10: 72.8
 147.7: 68.2
 150.6: 72.1

Proverbs

8.9: 41.3
 8.10: 41.4
 8.22: 42.1, 44.1
 8.22-25: 43.4
 10.14: 43.2
 20.27: 15.3, 15.9,
 16.1
 31.10: 101.6

Ecclesiastes

4.9: 18.4
 4.13: 18.4
 7.2: 18.4
 7.8: 18.4
 9.4: 18.4
 9.16: 42.7

Song of Songs

1.3: 40.3
 1.7: 102.1
 5.10: 49.1, 49.4
 6.2: 54.7

Wisdom

7.15: 42.7
 8.2: 42.7
 12.12: 61.4
 12.24: 103.4
 14.12: 2.4, 102.7
 14.15: 106.8

Sirach

3.21: 12.4
 3.22: 12.4
 18.17: 18.4

Isaiah

1.2: 71.3
 4.4: 72.3
 6.1: 53.2
 6.2-3: 10.2, 117.7
 6.3: 10.3, 26.1, 69.7
 6.5: 54.1
 6.9: 103.6
 7.12: 32.8
 7.14: 30.2, 32.7,
 32.8, 32.10,
 116.2
 8.4: 31.7, 38.1, 40.7
 9.5 LXX: 19.4, 19.6,
 70.8, 71.6
 9.6: 19.6
 11.2: 69.6
 26.19: 97.1, 99.2
 27.12 LXX: 112.4
 29.10: 72.5
 34.4: 99.4
 35.6: 31.8
 40.28: 31.2, 33.1,
 36.2
 42.1: 35.1, 78.7
 44.1: 49.1, 49.2
 45.2: 65.2
 48.16: 69.6
 50.6: 31.3, 36.4
 52.13 LXX: 78.7
 53.6: 115.2
 53.9: 80.1

55.8: 48.7
57.15 LXX: 10.5,
68.10

Jeremiah

2.13: 19.2
2.18: 58.3
11.20: 15.3
13.1-7: 115.3
17.5-6: 92.8
17.9: 30.4, 32.3, 32.6
17.10: 15.3

Ezekiel

1.26: 53.2
18.4: 78.1
37.4: 88.2
37.4-8: 99.5
37.7: 88.2
37.9: 99.5
37.10: 88.5

Daniel

2.34: 40.5
3.1-30: 23.1
3.25: 25.2
3.38 LXX: 23.4
3.52 LXX: 25.5
3.54 LXX: 25.5
3.55 LXX: 25.5
3.57 LXX: 24.1,
24.4, 25.3, 25.6,
117.7
7.9: 53.2
12.2: 99.4
13.45-49 Vg: 25.2

Susanna

45-49: 25.2

Hosea

4.12: 72.5
7.11: 77.2

11.9: 111.5
14.10 LXX: 27.2

Joel

2.28: 67.7

Amos

3.2: 20.10
4.13: 5.3, 5.4, 5.5,
71.3

Micah

5.2: 28.1, 30.3,
115.8, 116.1

Haggai

2.5: 5.1, 69.5
2.11: 69.4

Malachi

4.2: 45.5

New Testament

Matthew

1.2-4: 114.7
1.2-16: 59.4
1.16: 60.2
1.20: 67.1
1.21: 108.7
1.23: 30.2, 116.2
2.6: 30.3
3.4: 115.3
3.9: 61.6
3.11: 115.3
3.17: 3.6, 49.1, 49.5,
117.3
4.1: 5.2
4.2: 31.2, 33.1
7.11: 18.4
8.5-13: 98.5
8.24: 31.2
8.25: Letter 2.4
8.28: 72.5
10.10: 68.6
10.16: 68.4
10.19-20: 69.8
10.20: 5.1, 8.4
10.36: 116.7
11.27: 11.3, 19.7,
67.5, 73.1

11.28: 65.8
12.18: 78.7
12.28: 69.8
12.43: 72.5
13.24: 42.5
13.25: Letter 1.1
13.30: 22.3
13.31: 42.3
13.47: 42.5
16.13: 31.6, 38.1,
38.7, 39.7
16.14: 39.7
16.15: 39.7
16.16: 2.2, 39.7
16.16-17: 9.4
16.17: 2.2
16.18: 9.6
16.19: 9.7
16.22-23: 34.6
18.20: 9.13, 10.1
19.17: 18.3
19.21: Letter 3,
intro.
19.26: 61.3, 88.1
20.21: 108.2
22.29: 26.7
24.36: 16.2, 22.4

25.10: 100.2
26.26-28: 57.3, 57.5
26.33: 9.9
26.34: 9.9
26.39: 34.7
26.69-74: 9.9
26.75: 9.10
27.52-53: 100.2
28.19: 7.1, 8.7, 68.6,
74.3, 81.1

Mark

1.12: 5.2, 69.8
1.23: 72.5
1.26: 72.5
3.29: 69.8
4.9: 26.7
4.38: 31.2
5.8: 72.5
5.9: 72.5
5.22-24: 98.5
5.30: 31.6, 38.1, 38.6
5.34: 38.6
5.35-43: 98.5
6.38: 31.6, 108.2,
108.6
6.52: 28.2

Mark (*cont.*)

7.32: 72.5
9.25: 72.5
10.17: 18.6
10.18: 18.1
12.24: 26.7
12.26-27: 39.2
13.32: 16.2, 19.6
14.22-24: 57.3, 57.5
14.29: 9.9
14.30: 9.9
14.36: 34.7
14.66-71: 9.9
14.72: 9.10
16.6: 90.5, 91.5
16.19: 17.6

Luke

1.6: 80.2
1.18: 66.5
1.30: 49.4
1.33: 19.1
1.34: 66.5
1.35: 66.5
1.42: 66.7
2.40: 31.7, 38.1, 69.8
2.52: 31.7, 38.1, 40.2,
40.6, 78.9, 79.5
3.23-38: 59.4
3.32-36: 114.7
4.1: 69.8
4.2: 31.2, 33.1
4.14: 69.8
4.18: 5.3, 69.6
4.36: 72.5
4.41: 72.2
5.21: 27.4
6.18: 72.5
6.46: 18.6
7.11-17: 92.4, 98.5
7.14: 100.5
8.23: 31.2
8.24: Letter 2.4
8.30: 72.5
8.31: 72.2
8.45: 31.6, 38.1,
38.6, 108.2, 108.5
8.48: 38.6
8.54: 100.1, 100.4
9.55: 26.7
10.4: 68.6

10.38-42: 108.4
11.13: 2.1
12.48: 26.8
13.11: 72.5
13.27: 20.9
15.8: 42.5
18.14: 23.5
19.41: 31.4, 36.4
20.37-38: 39.2
22.14-20: 57.3, 57.5
22.42: 34.7
22.43: 37.4
22.43-44: 31.5, 37.1
22.44: 37.3
22.54-61: 9.9
22.62: 9.10
23.43: 54.7
23.46: 69.8
24.39: 91.6

John

1.1: 69.9
1.2: 5.6
1.3: 28.4, 74.4, 75.1
1.3-4: 69.8, 75.2
1.9: 3.9, 4.1, 4.6,
67.7, 70.4
1.14: 19.4, 35.5,
65.3, 66.1, 78.8,
119.7
1.18: 2.5, 3.9, 5.5,
53.3
1.41: 66.3
1.45: 36.4, 66.3
3.5: 72.8
3.6: 69.8
3.8: 72.8
3.15: 2.3
4.6: 31.2
4.10: 26.7
4.13-14: 66.9
4.24: 7.8, 46.6, 47.3,
57.1, 70.1, 70.7
5.17: 28.5, 38.2
5.22: 21.1
5.23: 10.8
5.26: 16.3
5.31: 3.6, 3.7
5.31-32: 3.5
5.31-47: 108.5
5.36: 3.6

5.39: 3.6
5.46: 3.6
6.12: 48.2
6.44: 40.1
6.51: 66.8
7.38: 19.2
8.14: 3.6, 3.8
8.40: 44.4
8.55: 45.3
9.16: 27.4
10.11: 34.3
10.15: 34.3
10.18: 34.3, 35.3
10.33: 45.3
11.1-6: 92.4
11.11: 38.3
11.25: 92.8, 100.1
11.34: 31.6, 38.1,
38.3, 108.2, 108.4
11.35: 38.5
11.39: 38.5
11.43: 100.1, 100.6
11.44: 98.4
11.56: 108.7
12.24: 90.3
12.27: 34.3, 34.4,
35.3
14.2: 48.5
14.6: 5.1, 40.1, 70.6
14.10: 117.5
14.16: 8.4, 70.4,
70.7, 119.10
14.16-17: 69.8
14.17: 3.8, 5.1, 8.4,
70.4, 71.2, 71.6,
72.6, 81.2
14.23: 69.5
14.26: 8.4, 70.4,
70.7, 119.10
14.28: 17.4
15.1: 66.8
15.26: 3.8, 5.1, 6.9,
7.1, 8.4, 11.3,
67.1, 70.4, 70.7,
71.2, 71.6, 72.6,
72.9, 73.1, 81.2,
118.11, 119.10
16.7: 5.1, 8.4, 70.4,
70.7, 81.9, 119.10
16.12-14: 72.9
16.13: 3.8, 5.1, 8.4,

70.4, 71.2, 71.6,
72.6, 81.2
16.14: 6.9, 7.1, 8.4,
11.3, 67.1, 73.1
16.15: 16.3
17.2-3: 2.3
17.3: 2.4, 2.5, 3.9
18.4: 31.6, 38.1,
108.2, 108.7
20.17: 27.7, 29.2,
29.3, 29.6, 29.7,
29.8, 30.1, 30.2,
30.3, 30.4, 30.5,
32.2, 32.3, 90.5
20.25-27: 91.1
20.27: 90.5
21.5: 9.12, 90.5
21.6: 9.12
21.7: 9.12
21.15: 9.13

Acts

1.4: 69.8
2.24: 34.2
2.27: 34.1, 91.5
2.33: 69.8
2.36: 44.2
4.10: 41.1
4.34-35: Letter 3,
intro.
5.3: 9.2, 69.8
5.3-4: 118.1
5.4: 9.2, 69.8
7.7: 110.1
7.14-15: 59.2
9.4: 11.4
9.6: 68.3
10.38: 69.6
10.42: 19.2
13.2: 68.3
13.4: 68.4
15.28: 68.5
16.6-7: 68.6
16.16: 72.5
16.31-32: 69.9
16.34: 69.9
20.22: 68.8
20.23: 68.9
20.28: 69.10
20.35: 68.7
21.4: 68.7

21.10-11: 68.7
26.14: 14.6
27.37: 59.2, 78.1

Romans

1.4: 68.10
1.22: 70.3
1.25: 70.3, 103.4
2.11: 98.2
2.29: 68.11
3.5-6: 87.6
3.25: 65.8
3.27: 65.3
3.28: 67.3
4.19: 94.5
5.1: 69.1
6.2: 12.5, 20.10,
43.10, 47.5, 48.4,
48.5, 78.7, 80.1,
98.2
6.9: 81.1, 92.5
7.18: 79.1
7.19: 64.5
7.22: 65.4, 77.6
7.23: 56.3
7.25: 65.3
8.2: 65.3
8.3: 65.9
8.4: 65.3
8.8: 76.5
8.9: 3.8, 6.9, 8.4,
8.5, 8.6, 10.7,
67.3, 70.4, 72.6,
119.10
8.11: 66.12
8.14: 66.10
8.23: 68.13
8.26: 68.14
8.34: 68.14
9.5: 44.3, 69.9
9.19: 96.1
9.20: 71.1
9.31: 65.3
9.32: 27.3
10.4: 94.4
11.8: 72.5
11.17-22: Letter 1.4
11.33: 94.1
15.8: 68.1
15.16: 68.15

1 Corinthians

1.20: 42.7
1.21: 42.7
1.30: 42.7, 65.9
2.5: 42.7
2.8: 93.8
2.10: 7.1, 12.3, 15.1,
15.5, 16.1, 68.16,
118.2
2.11: 11.5, 12.1,
72.3
2.12: 68.17, 72.3
2.12-13: 14.5, 70.8
2.14: 107.6
2.16: 76.1
3.9: 26.5
3.11: 26.5
3.12: 26.5
3.16: 9.3, 68.12,
68.18
4.15: 72.8
6.11: 69.1
7.7: 26.8
7.10: 68.5
7.29: 107.1
7.31: 115.3
8.7: 26.6, 26.8
10.1-2: 56.5
10.22: 69.3
12.3: 3.1, 69.2
12.4-6: 7.4, 69.2
12.8: 16.7
12.8-10: 72.7
12.10: 72.2
12.11: 16.7, 72.7
13.9: 94.2
14.14: 76.5
14.15: 56.3, 76.5,
77.7
14.32: 72.4
15.20: 92.2, 92.5
15.23: 68.13
15.36: 83.4
15.36-38: 90.2
15.38: 96.5
15.43: 90.2
15.45: 56.2
15.52: 95.4
15.53: 90.1
15.55: 37.6

2 Corinthians

3.6: 22.5
 3.18: 69.2
 4.7: 89.2
 4.16: 77.6
 5.15: 65.5
 5.17: 116.5
 5.18-19: 66.1
 5.19: 65.5
 6.16: 68.18
 8.9: 81.1
 10.13: 1.2
 12.2: 54.3
 12.2-3: 54.5
 12.3-4: 54.4
 12.4: 11.5
 13.3: 68.7, 90.3
 13.5: 68.17

Galatians

1.15-16: 68.16
 1.20: 68.9
 2.21: 55.6
 3.1: 77.2
 3.2: 67.3
 4.3: 2.4
 4.4: 30.4, 33.1, 80.3
 4.5: 65.9
 5.17: 76.5
 5.19: 79.1
 5.19-21: 76.5
 6.7: 110.1, 114.8
 6.16: 119.16
 6.17: 63.1

Ephesians

1.10: 65.7
 1.21: 81.1
 2.14: 65.8
 2.14-16: 65.8
 2.16: 65.8
 2.20: 26.5
 3.1: 68.8
 3.6: 65.8
 3.15: 71.3
 4.5: 118.3
 4.14: 74.1
 4.30: 69.3
 6.12: 72.5
 6.19: 101.4

Philippians

1.10: 68.15
 2.6: 28.6, 45.1
 2.6-7: 44.5
 2.7: 28.6, 40.2, 45.2,
 66.6, 80.3
 2.8: 92.6
 2.10: 37.4
 3.20: 107.4
 3.21: 65.11

Colossians

1.13: 50.1
 1.15: 19.1
 1.16: 73.9
 1.19-20: 65.6
 1.26: 65.10
 2.3: 70.6
 2.6: 68.12
 2.9: 65.11, 80.2
 2.11: 68.11, 73.8
 2.14-15: 65.2
 2.15: 37.6

1 Thessalonians

5.2: 21.2
 5.4: 21.2
 5.23: 77.4

1 Timothy

1.12: 69.10
 1.17: 43.2
 1.20: 6.1
 2.5: 44.5, 44.6, 66.1
 2.10: 109.5
 3.16: 69.8
 4.1: 69.4
 6.16: 70.5

2 Timothy

1.7: 72.5
 2.19: Letter 1.1, 20.9

Titus

1.12: 77.2
 2.10: 69.9
 2.11-12: 69.9
 2.11-14: 65.1
 2.13: 69.9
 3.5: 115.2

Philemon

1: 68.8

Hebrews

1.1: 5.3
 1.3: 19.1
 2.11: 41.6
 3.1-2: 41.1, 41.2,
 41.6, 41.8
 4.12: 56.1
 5.1: 41.5, 93.3
 8.13: 94.5
 10.12: 81.8
 10.29: 72.6
 11.4: 94.4
 11.5: 94.4, 98.6
 11.7: 94.4
 11.11: 94.5
 11.17-19: 94.5

1 Peter

2.4: 19.4
 2.5: 66.1
 2.22: 80.1
 2.25: 101.4
 3.18: 34.9, 44.3, 93.6
 3.20: 59.1
 4.1: 44.3, 93.6
 4.11: Letter 2.5, 73.9
 5.4: 101.4
 5.6: 102.4

1 John

1.5: 3.9, 4.1, 4.6,
 70.5
 2.19: 116.7
 4.10: 50.2
 4.12: 53.8

2 John

12: 117.1

Revelation

3.20: 69.5
 5.12-13: 37.5, 37.7
 7.12: 37.5, 37.7

